

Mr. JONES of Washington (after having voted in the negative). I understand the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] did not vote. I promised to pair with him for the afternoon, but I understand on this amendment he would vote as I have voted. Therefore I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CARAWAY. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and vote "nay."

The roll call resulted—yeas 27, nays 21, as follows:

## YEAS—27.

Broussard	Hale	Newberry	Smoot
Bursum	Kendrick	Nicholson	Spencer
Cameron	Lodge	Norbeck	Stanfield
Coff	McCumber	Oddie	Sterling
Curtis	McNary	Pepper	Warren
Ernst	Moses	Phipps	Willis
Gooding	New	Ransdell	

## NAYS—21.

Borah	Heflin	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Lenroot	Simmons	
Glass	Nelson	Stanley	
Harris	Overman	Trammell	

## NOT VOTING—48.

Ashurst	Fletcher	La Follette	Reed
Ball	France	McCormick	Shields
Brandeggee	Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Shortridge
Calder	Gerry	McKinley	Smith
Crow	Harrell	McLean	Sutherland
Culberson	Harrison	Myers	Swanson
Cummins	Hitchcock	Norris	Townsend
Dillingham	Johnson	Owen	Underwood
du Pont	Kellogg	Page	Watson, Ga.
Edge	Keyes	Pittman	Watson, Ind.
Elkins	King	Poindexter	Weller
Fernald	Ladd	Rawson	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment of the committee as amended, the yeas are 27 and the nays are 21, no quorum having voted.

## RECESS.

Mr. McCUMBER. In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, I move that the Senate now take a recess, the recess being until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I suggest that the Senator from North Dakota give notice that we shall have a vote the very first thing after convening.

Mr. McCUMBER. We shall have to vote immediately on convening.

Mr. LODGE. We could not do anything else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, July 29, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, July 29, 1922.

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 20, 1922.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

## THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll, to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Stanfield
Borah	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Stanley
Brandeggee	Kellogg	Nicholson	Sterling
Bursum	Kendrick	Norbeck	Swanson
Capper	Keyes	Oddie	Trammell
Caraway	Lenroot	Overman	Underwood
Cummins	Lodge	Phipps	Wadsworth
Curtis	McCumber	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	McKinley	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Ernst	McLean	Sheppard	Warren
Gooding	McNary	Simmons	Willis
Harris	Moses	Smoot	
Heflin	Nelson	Spencer	

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague [Mr. Watson of Georgia] is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. DIAL. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH] is detained on official business. I ask that this notice may continue through the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the committee amendment inserting paragraph 1109 as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day. I vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], I vote "yea."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAIGE], I vote "yea." I will let this announcement of my pair and transfer stand for the day.

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], I vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER], I vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DIAL. I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay." If my colleague [Mr. SMITH] were present and not paired, he would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. WILLIS. I am paired with my colleague [Mr. POMERENE] and therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER] with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]; and

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 24, as follows:

## YEAS—26.

Brandeggee	Keyes	New	Smoot
Broussard	Lodge	Newberry	Spencer
Bursum	McCumber	Nicholson	Stanfield
Curtis	McKinley	Norbeck	Sterling
Ernst	McLean	Oddie	Warren
Gooding	McNary	Phipps	
Kendrick	Moses	Ransdell	

## NAYS—24.

Ashurst	Harris	Nelson	Swanson
Borah	Heflin	Overman	Trammell
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson	Underwood
Caraway	Kellogg	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lenroot	Simmons	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Myers	Stanley	Walsh, Mont.

## NOT VOTING—48.

Ball	Edge	Hale	La Follette
Calder	Elkins	Harrell	McCormick
Cameron	Fernald	Harrison	McKellar
Coff	Fletcher	Hitchcock	Norris
Crow	France	Johnson	Owen
Culberson	Frelinghuysen	Jones, Wash.	Page
Dillingham	Gerry	King	Pepper
du Pont	Glass	Ladd	Pittman

Poindexter  
Pomerene  
Rawson  
Reed

Shields  
Shortridge  
Smith  
Sutherland

Townsend  
Watson, Ga.  
Watson, Ind.  
Weller

Williams  
Willis

So the amendment of the committee as amended was agreed to.

#### PETITIONS.

Mr. ROBINSON presented resolutions of the Arkansas Association of Pharmacists, favoring inclusion in the pending tariff bill of a prohibition against importation of merchandise bearing any trade-mark, label, print, or other mark registered in the United States Patent Office and owned by any person domiciled in the United States, unless imported by such owner, provided the owner shall file with the Secretary of the Treasury a certified copy of the registration of the mark, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1715) for the relief of the heirs of Almon R. Proctor, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 839) thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2750) to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Regular Army of Second Lieut. Ambrose I. Moriarity, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 840) thereon.

#### BRANCH OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANK AT DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. McLEAN. From the Committee on Banking and Currency I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 229) authorizing the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago to enter into contracts for the erection of a building for its branch office in Detroit, Mich. I do not suppose there will be any objection to the joint resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator if the joint resolution takes care of the other two branch offices?

Mr. McLEAN. No; there are two others. They are all approved by the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. SMOOT. I know they are.

Mr. HEFLIN. Let the joint resolution go over. I should like to look into it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Objection is made, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

#### RIO GRANDE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD introduced a bill (S. 3874) granting the consent of Congress for a temporary toll bridge and a permanent bridge across the Rio Grande River, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and desire to have printed an amendment which is designed as a substitute for paragraph 1215 of the silk schedule.

I also desire now to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its session on this legislative day it recess until Monday next at 11 o'clock a. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed, and, without objection, the unanimous consent for which he asks, that when the Senate closes its session on this legislative day it take a recess until Monday next at 11 o'clock a. m., is granted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Finance I ask that paragraph 1110, beginning in line 11, on page 147, down to and including line 11, be stricken from the bill.

This paragraph provides for the 2 per cent ad valorem duty additional where the cloth is cut in suit lengths or where the cloth has been shrunk or dampened or sponged before being shipped from the foreign country into the United States. The House of Representatives no doubt inserted this provision in the bill because of the fact that when cloth is sponged or dampened, as it has to be before it can be made into a suit, it shrinks and loses in length about 2 per cent.

It is, however, a small matter, and, so far as the cloth being cut into suit lengths is concerned—and a great many of the importations reach the customhouse in that form—there is always a 15 per cent increase in price on cloth so cut and shrunk. So the 15 per cent addition in the price, while it will not entirely take care of the shrinkage, will take care of

a part of it, and the committee thinks, that being so, it is not necessary further to take the matter into consideration at all.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. The effect of the Senator's proposal to strike out the paragraph to which he refers, if agreed to, would be to diminish the rate that would otherwise be imposed on that class of goods?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is the object of the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think the Senate is to be congratulated upon the fact that there is something connected with the manufacture of textiles which is not to be subjected to a duty. Every possible waste in the process of manufacture seems to have been provided for in the bill as presented; but now we are, I am glad to say, advised that the committee has finally, after mature deliberation, decided to strike out this paragraph imposing a duty to compensate for every little item of shrinkage in the process of manufacturing woolen goods.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, after consulting with a number of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber and some on the other side, in view of certain editorials which have been appearing in the leading metropolitan newspapers, principally Republican newspapers, I shall ask leave at the conclusion of the few remarks I am about to make to introduce and have immediately considered a resolution.

In the New York Herald of the 26th of July appeared an editorial of which I shall read only a portion, omitting the names of those who are mentioned. It says:

The shocking thing about the tariff duties on wool now being jammed through the United States Senate is not merely that they are extravagantly, inordinately, incomparably excessive. Other tariff duties framed by the Finance Committee and adopted by the general membership of the Senate are, from the point of view of economic sense and of consideration for the consuming public, so high as to be outrageous. The wool schedule, therefore, has plenty of bad company. But that is not all there is to say against the wool tariff.

The worst indictment of the wool schedule and of the men responsible for it, bad as is the wool tax itself, is that the wool duties were made and are being driven through the Senate under whip and spur by United States Senators who are financially interested, directly and heavily, in the growing of sheep and the production of wool. The circumstances are flagrant.

I am omitting the names of those mentioned—

Their performance is the last word in personally interested, private-pocket statesmanship.

I am skipping again—

Yet Members of the United States Senate, up to their necks in the business of growing sheep and producing wool, have not hesitated to make the highest wool duties in the history of the country—have not hesitated in a matter deeply touching their own private pockets, to put an extra wool tax on the American people estimated at not less than \$200,000,000 a year.

A newspaper published here in the city of Washington yesterday contained an editorial in which a Senator is named, saying that he has been absent until the duty on wool was to be fixed; that he came then and was exceedingly interested in putting through that schedule; and it quoted from his biography as it appears in the Congressional Directory—and I shall omit his name—which says:

Engaged in the live-stock industry, being America's largest producer of wool and mutton.

Other papers are carrying similar charges. It has been asserted that certain Senators were even interested in purchasing the products that are to be affected by either this or the emergency tariff and in forming pools and selling on a higher market.

I, of course, make no comment as to whether the charges are true or false. I shall leave each Senator, of course, as I will be compelled to do, to determine for himself how far he may consistently with his own honor and the public good vote for a measure that directly enriches him.

But, Mr. President, I sat in the gallery here a few years ago, before I was a Member of either body and when I expected never to be a Member of either, and saw a judge impeached while standing at the corner of the Vice President's rostrum. It was charged that as a judge he influenced the sale of a coal dump. I doubt if any Senator thought that he directly profited by his conduct. It was thought, however, by the Senate—and many of the Senators voting in that case then are here now—that he was so intimately related to the transaction that his usefulness as a public servant, as a judge of a court, had been destroyed, and that he should be impeached, and he was impeached. He was driven out of public office in disgrace, and his family were disgraced, because it was suspected that he had abused his office to try to influence the price of a coal dump in which he might have some interest.



I deny, Mr. President, that the honor of the bench is any more sacred than the honor of the Senate of the United States. This judge was the chief justice of a court which Congress had created, and therefore he was a creature of this legislative body; he had been confirmed by a vote of the Senate; but he was driven out of public office because it was thought that he had not been circumspect in the use of his official position and that possibly he tried to profit by some judicial act of his.

The constitution of my State, and I presume of every State, and of the United States forbids a judge to sit in judgment upon a cause in which he is interested. It not only forbids him to sit in a case in which he is interested but in which a kinsman down to the third degree is interested, so jealous are we of the honor and integrity of the courts and so considerate of the rights of the individual.

The laws everywhere forbid a juror to be accepted to sit in a cause in which he is financially interested or in which a near relative of his might be so interested. Can we say that we are more concerned for the honor and integrity of the courts than we are for the legislative honor?

A judge may be dishonest, and his decision may affect only a few people, the litigants before him. It can not be said that this body can be influenced by a personal consideration and affect the welfare of but a few people, because we legislate for all the people; and the honor and the dignity and the respect and the confidence of this country must be reposed in the integrity and honor of the Senate as one of the bodies of the legislative branch of the Government or else the Government ends.

If a decision had been handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States, we will say, in Smith against Jones, and it should be charged in reputable papers that five members of that court were interested in the decision, and that their wealth was increased by it, that \$200,000,000 worth of property was affected by their decision, and that they profited by this decision, unless they could show that that was not true this body would impeach them. It would sit in judgment on them when the charge has been made in the other body, and we would drive them out of office. Here are reputable papers, Republican papers, saying that this legislation was framed and is being jammed through this body by men who are legislating to put money in their own pockets. The Senators whose names were mentioned in the editorial to which I have referred have not seen fit to demand an investigation. I am unwilling that the incident shall be closed without our knowing whether it is true or not.

Yesterday one of the most respected Members of this body, a man who possesses the confidence of every man who knows him, Democrat and Republican alike, said this:

It is evident, it seems to me, that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], in his zeal to put such an immense tariff on these agricultural products—higher than we have ever had before, higher than there was any necessity for—has done so simply to oil the protection machine for the woolen schedule and some other schedules in the bill. I do not want to do the Senator from North Dakota any injustice. This is simply a notion of mine. I do not make the charge against him, of course. I would not think of doing that. It is only a notion and a suspicion of mine.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. BURSUM. Under what authority would the Senator suggest that the Senate should investigate this matter?

Mr. CARAWAY. I am proposing in a resolution to let the Committee on the Judiciary, either by the full committee or by a special committee, for which there is precedent, investigate it.

Mr. BURSUM. Does not the Senator believe that the charge to which he is referring might with equal justice be made against any Member of this body who might have voted on any schedule which has been passed upon by the Senate? Might not the owner of a farm, who may produce a few turnips, who may raise a few bushels of oats or a few bushels of wheat, also be charged with having a personal interest, and might not anyone who represented some other interest be charged with the same thing? Would it not be impossible to have a body representative of the people of this country and limit its membership to those who had no interest of any kind or character in legislation and who would not be affected by it?

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CARAWAY. I will yield. I wanted to answer the question of the Senator from New Mexico, but I will hear the Senator from Idaho first.

Mr. GOODING. While the Senator is drafting his resolution will he not be kind enough to incorporate in it a direction to investigate as to why the junior Senator from Arkansas voted for a high protective tariff on rice?

Mr. CARAWAY. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that I am not interested, directly or indirectly, and that no kinspeople of mine are interested, in a grain of rice.

Mr. GOODING. How is the Senate to know whether the Senator is or not?

Mr. CARAWAY. I know it; and I will say to the Senator that if anybody said I was I would say that he was an unqualified liar. That is what I would say, because I do not legislate for myself.

Mr. GOODING. We will investigate and see why the Senator voted for it, and why he has condemned every other schedule.

Mr. CARAWAY. Investigate.

Mr. GOODING. That is the most extraordinary exception.

Mr. CARAWAY. Investigate; investigate. The resolution is going to require me to disclose it, as it will require the Senator from Idaho to disclose his interest. I am willing to do it. I would spurn the idea of trying to take money from somebody else to put into my pocket by legislation, and I am willing that every other Senator shall have a chance to show how he stands on that matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield to the Senator from Utah now.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, from what the Senator has said, if a statement was made in the paper that was not true he would not approve of any such statement, would he?

Mr. CARAWAY. No, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I want to say to the Senator that the article in the New York Herald of July 26, which the Senator has just read, charges me with being a Member of the Senate who is interested in the tariff upon wool.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know it, sir; but I did not put it in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator, as I have said before, that I have not owned a sheep or a lamb since I sold all that I had immediately after Grover Cleveland was elected.

Mr. CARAWAY. I heard the Senator say that the other day.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not own a single head of sheep, and I do not know of a relative of mine who owns a single head of sheep.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not doubt that, and I thought, in view of what I had heard the Senator say, that this article did him a grave injustice; but we will give each Senator a chance.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President—

Mr. CARAWAY. If it is right to do these things, no Senator can complain of having it made public that he does them. That is evident. If it is right, he will not complain. If it is right, he has no objection to having it known. If it is wrong, he has no right to ask that it be concealed.

Mr. ODDIE and Mr. BURSUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CARAWAY. I started in with the Senator from New Mexico. I will yield to the Senator from Nevada just as soon as I am through with him.

Mr. BURSUM. Just by way of calling attention to the unreliability and the recklessness and the malice, for no other purpose, apparently, except to capitalize prejudice, of the statement which the Senator from Arkansas referred to in a paper called the Daily News, I believe, there is one statement with reference to myself as to which I wish to say that I should be very glad if it were true, namely, that I am one of the millionaires of this body. I should be perfectly willing to give my note for half the amount stated in that article and turn it over to anyone who would agree to have it discounted at the bank, and I will divide with the fellow who obtains that discount. There is nothing further from the fact; and if the rest of the article is no more accurate than that—

Mr. CARAWAY. That is the very reason, then, why there ought to be an investigation. If Senators have been slandered, they ought to have a chance to appear in a forum where they can vindicate themselves.

Mr. BURSUM. I have no objection to an investigation or to the world knowing everything about this matter. I may question the propriety of a representative body like the Senate of the United States taking notice of every little slur that may be published by some half-brained fellow who may be in the employ of some political party or of some particular interest for the purpose of disseminating propaganda. If we are to

spend our time attending to those things, we will not do anything else.

Mr. CARAWAY. If the Senator thinks it is merely a little slur to have it charged in the newspapers all over this country that he was voting to put money in his pocket, which meant that he was voting to take money out of somebody else's pocket, he does not look at what is a little slur as I do. I am going to afford the Senator, if he does not object to the consideration of the resolution, an opportunity to vindicate himself.

Mr. BURSUM. I have nothing to vindicate. I want to ask the Senator this question: If there is a Member of this body who happens to be interested in a patch of potatoes, and who voted for a tariff on potatoes, would the Senator charge him with acting improperly?

Mr. CARAWAY. I might want to know what the size of the potato patch was, and how much his direct interest was. I am going to say in good faith to the Senator that I realize that it may become difficult to draw the exact line.

Mr. BURSUM. So far as being interested in the industry is concerned, I have said on the floor of the Senate that I was interested in it. There is no secret about that.

Mr. CARAWAY. All right; then the Senator will have no objection to the resolution?

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CARAWAY. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I could not hear what the article was that the Senator from Arkansas put into the Record. Was it an editorial from the New York Herald?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir. I left out the names of everybody who was mentioned, and read just the charging part.

Mr. ODDIE. That editorial mentioned my name, did it not, as being interested in sheep?

Mr. CARAWAY. I have not the editorial before me. I do not know, but I think it did.

Mr. ODDIE. I saw the editorial yesterday, and I wish to state to the Senator that I do not own one sheep, and am not interested in any manner whatever in sheep, except that I am interested in the welfare of the West and the upbuilding of the West and consequently the welfare of our whole country.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator has a right to be.

Mr. ODDIE. Just as the Senator says he is interested in Arkansas rice, I am interested in sheep.

Mr. BURSUM and Mr. GOODING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CARAWAY. I am going to let the Senator from New Mexico get through with his questions first.

Mr. BURSUM. I simply desire to ask the Senator from Nevada if he pleads guilty to being a millionaire.

Mr. CARAWAY. He is not charged with that.

Mr. BURSUM. Yes; it is said that he is one of them.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is he charged with being a millionaire?

Mr. BURSUM. Yes; he is charged with being a millionaire.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, possibly.

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STANFIELD. I simply want to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question. In his opinion is a member of a legislative body disqualified from voting on a legislative measure because it affects in some way an industry in which he may be interested?

Mr. CARAWAY. I should not say "in some way." If he is directly financially interested in the result, I should like to answer the Senator in the language of Jefferson's Manual, which we have always thought to be a rule of the Senate. It reads in this way—I am reading from section 17, on page 249:

Where the private interests of a member are concerned in a bill or question he is to withdraw. And where such an interest has appeared his voice has been disallowed, even after a division. In a case so contrary, not only to the laws of decency but to the fundamental principle of the social compact, which denies to any man to be a judge in his own cause, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to.

I am going to say to the Senator that I do not know where the line lies. If the interest of a representative is merely that of the American people, if he has no special interest, it is presumed that legislation will be helpful to us all, and where his interest is general I think there is no question about his right to participate in the legislation; but where he is to be directly financially benefited by his vote it seems to me that he ought not to cast a vote.

Mr. STANFIELD. Does not the Senator think, rather, that instead of applying the rule in that way, if the Senator is not

so big that he will not be influenced, and is not going to vote according to a principle, he should withdraw from the industry in which he is engaged, rather than not do his legislative duty here? The Senator surely realizes that if we are to enact a tariff bill—in which the Senator does not believe; it is well known that the Senator from Arkansas is opposed to a protective tariff, except in a very few instances he is in favor of a free-trade proposition—

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator would do well to state his own position, and not mine.

Mr. STANFIELD. There are a number here who are interested in this woolen schedule. Some may be the owners of ranches. It is laudable for a man to be the owner of ranch property. It is laudable for a man to be a flockmaster, the owner of a flock. If he is, should he then stand aside and permit an injustice to be done to the great industry in which he is interested?

I want to say to the Senator now that if any Senator here believes in a protective tariff, he can defend this woolen schedule fairly and truly, under the principle of a protective tariff, which is that an industry is entitled to protection equal to the difference in the costs of production in this country and the foreign countries in competition in the home market. I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that, so far as the duty on wool is concerned, this tariff does not represent the difference between the cost of production in this country and in foreign countries with which this country comes in competition. Further, I hope the Senator is not impugning the character or the standing of any Senator here, in voting for this woolen schedule, because he happens to be interested in wool. I am interested in wool, and I believe my interest in it only fits me to vote intelligently here, more intelligently, perhaps, than many others who have not given it a thought, but simply stand here on this floor and oppose the principle of a protective tariff.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me ask the Senator a question. Suppose that a judge has a lawsuit in which he is interested. He doubtless knows more about it than any juror who could be selected. Yet would we expect him to try the case?

Mr. STANFIELD. But this is a legislative body, not a judicial body, and there is no one here who knows better than the Senator from Arkansas that there is a difference. We know that a legislative body should not function as a judicial body. We pass judicial questions on to the judiciary. We are not standing here passing judgment; we are here enacting a law, according to a principle, that is to save a great industry in our country.

Mr. CARAWAY. The judge might say it was to save a right he had, and therefore he wanted to sit in the trial, so that no mistake would be made. He would know how to render a judgment to protect his interests. I am not here charging anybody with anything. I say that certain charges have been made in the newspapers to the effect that Senators are influenced by their financial interests. I do not know whether it is true or not, and I am not going to pass judgment on it.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, does the Senator from Arkansas believe all he sees in the newspapers?

Mr. CARAWAY. I am going to be very largely compelled to believe or disbelieve by the attitude which the Congress itself may take with reference to whether it wants the facts known; and the country is of the same opinion. Let me say this to the Senator from Oregon—I am not pointing the accusing finger at anyone: Charges have been made. They have been made by members of his own party, by men who believe in the same theory he professes to believe in, in protection. They have said that the rates are unconscionable; that they are indefensible; that they are outrageous; and that they are the result of pocketbook legislation. Those are charges made by people on your side. I do not know whether they are true or false. Every Senator can answer under his own conscience. But I do want to say this, and the Senator must know it to be true, that if the people out in the States are to believe these charges, that legislation is the result of corrupt bargaining, that men who have private interests get together and fix a tax on them that is going to cost the people hundreds of millions of dollars, that that is the way their laws are made, they are not going to respect law, and I do not blame them. If I believed that laws were bought and sold, I would owe no obedience to the law made or the government in which that thing could happen. It would become the duty of every self-respecting citizen to rise up not only in protest but if necessary in rebellion against a government where the laws were bought and sold.

This is a charge made by a reputable Republican paper. It has been reiterated here on the floor of the Senate. It was charged yesterday afternoon by a Member on your side whose



honor, and whose acute sense of honor, nobody questions, that it was an outrage, and, using his own language, to which I will go back, he said:

But, Mr. President, this is all "love's labor lost." We are in the hands of the wool Philistines. They have us by the throat, and perhaps it would be wiser for us to take the medicine in silence and turn our heads toward Providence and hope to get relief from that source.

Is it wise to let the impression go abroad that legislation is being framed by selfish interests, by men directly profiting by the legislation?

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator knows that the great American people are not accepting a report written in some paper by some individual.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not reading a paper; I am reading the language of Senator KNUTE NELSON, a man whose honor no man ever impugned.

Mr. STANFIELD. I have the highest respect for the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CARAWAY. And he uttered that sentiment here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. STANFIELD. I do not believe the Senator from Minnesota intended, and I do not believe the Senator from Arkansas thinks, that it was the intention of the Senator from Minnesota to impugn the motives of any Member of the Senate, and I do not believe that the great American people are going to accept any such opinion as that. I can understand that the Senator from Arkansas is attempting to write into the Record something to promote that feeling among the great American people, but the great American people indicated by their ballots not long ago that they believe in a protective tariff, and that they believe in the cardinal principles of a protective tariff.

Mr. CARAWAY. When was it they did that?

Mr. STANFIELD. In the last election, when, by the large majority of 7,000,000 votes, they put the Republican Party into power, and that party was pledged to a protective-tariff policy.

Mr. CARAWAY. I have heard so many alibis for what the people mistakenly did in 1920 that I am at a loss to know which of them to accept. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] assures us always that it was a repudiation of Wilson's League of Nations. Other Senators have ascribed it to the extravagance of the last administration. Now the Senator says it is because they want an embargo on wool.

Mr. STANFIELD. No; not on wool. I said they believed in the principle of a protective tariff. Do not put words in my mouth I did not use.

Mr. CARAWAY. Wool is what we happen to be discussing.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I would like to have the Senator inform me, if he knows, whether or not the rates in the wool schedule were increased in the Senate over the rates of the House, which, of course, is overwhelmingly Republican.

Mr. CARAWAY. They are.

Mr. TRAMMELL. They were increased in the Senate over the rates fixed by the House, although the House has a very large Republican majority, entertaining the same ideas of protection, as far as the general public is concerned, as are entertained in the Senate.

Mr. CARAWAY. They are closer to an election. If I may, I want to read an extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, 1909, page 1837. This is the utterance of a Republican Senator when a tariff bill was before the Senate:

\* \* \* Mr. President, I am myself placed in a position where I shall withhold my vote upon this amendment, and for this reason: Some years ago, when I was not in official life, I acquired an interest in land in Wisconsin which was believed to be, and which has proven to be, in part lead-bearing property. Some development has taken place upon it, and one portion of it is at this time producing lead ore in small quantities, and zinc ore as well. I make this statement now as covering both those products.

If maintaining duties or increasing duties affects the price of those products, I can not consistently and conscientiously vote upon this question as a Member of this body, and therefore upon this roll call, for the reason stated, withhold my vote.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, if that lead stock referred to is worth as much as some lead stock I know of, it would not bring the price of print paper. The Senator was not hazarding very much.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator must set up his own standard. I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by a man who was a Member of the Senate then and who is a Member of the Senate now, and merely in order not to drag him into the Record, I shall withhold his name. Two such occasions arose. On June 16, 1909, pages 3363 and 3364 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, he said:

\* \* \* Mr. President, as I am confident that the amendment offered by the committee will be adopted, I shall take the time of the Senate to submit a brief statement. \* \* \* Mr. President, for reasons which I stated when the paragraph on lead ore was under

consideration, I am compelled to withhold my vote on all questions or amendments offered as to paragraph 190.

I am interested in property which I believe will be increased in value if zinc ore is made dutiable as provided in the amendment proposed by the Finance Committee. For that reason I will ask to be excused from voting.

I am going to leave every man to be his own judge, whether he stands in a better light who declines to vote at all where his vote might increase his own wealth than the Senators who come together and frame a schedule which will put into their pockets money, a large amount of money, and for which they have been pilloried in the public press as having made this schedule because they were financially interested in it. I do not say it is true, but I say that every man who feels very acutely what public opinion might be, should want an opportunity to have all the facts known.

I know there is not a Senator on this floor who would not vote to impeach a judge if he were guilty of having done that thing. I know that under a law which Congress passed a Senator from this Chamber was taken to a court and convicted and imprisoned for violating a provision of that law, which declared that no Congressman should for hire, or as an attorney, appear before one of the departments, for fear he might unduly influence that department. You were so jealous of other people's honor that you made it a crime for a man who held a seat in either House of Congress to appear before one of the bureaus or one of the departments of the Government and try to influence that department, as an attorney, to render a decision, even in a matter which might not have involved five dollars worth of property.

I know of another Senator, I believe from the Senator's own State, who was indicted and carried west to his own State to be tried for having used influence in a matter affecting public land. He died before the trial, and what the result would have been I do not know.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. GOODING. I wanted to ask the Senator if he was the holder of property in his State of any kind.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, yes, sir.

Mr. GOODING. The Senator owns property down there?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir; and I would be glad to disclose what it is.

Mr. GOODING. Why did the Senator vote for a protective duty on rice?

Mr. CARAWAY. I have explained to the Senator over and over again—

Mr. GOODING. Was that not for the purpose of increasing the prosperity of the rice grower, enhancing the value of the Senator's own property?

Mr. CARAWAY. No.

Mr. GOODING. If the rice growers were prosperous—

Mr. CARAWAY. If I had had a dollar invested in rice I should not have voted, and I do not think I ought to have voted.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, if every Senator followed that out, there would not be a quorum to vote on the tariff question.

Mr. CARAWAY. If every Senator had a special interest, and came to write a law to make himself rich, it would be infinitely better if there never was a quorum in the Senate.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator that there is a way to settle this question without any investigation, a very proper way—

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, there is going to be an investigation; let Senators make no mistake about that.

Mr. CARAWAY. I have the floor.

Mr. STANLEY. I am not opposing an investigation, but I simply suggest, to save time, that we could easily enough determine this question by simply proposing an amendment, like that of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], providing for a sane reduction in the duty on raw wool, and I can not conceive it possible that Senators with a direct interest in a schedule in this bill have or will vote on it. If there are such, let them abstain from just one vote, and the question will be settled to the satisfaction of the country.

Just take one vote and let the men with a "take out in this pot" take no hand in the game, and the country and the press will be content.

Mr. GOODING. If the Senator would not restrict that to wool, if he would put that embargo on all agricultural products and manufactured products, and all others, of course—

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. GOODING. And rice.

Mr. STANLEY. Yes, sir; and rice.

Mr. GOODING. Certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. Rice and hemp and horses and mules, everything that is raised in Kentucky, from a quart of whisky to a row.

Mr. GOODING. The Senator should add jackasses.

Mr. CARAWAY. That would exclude the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. STANLEY. If ever we get to jackasses, I advise the Senator from Idaho to wait on the Lord in prayer, for He is the only one who can save him. But there is no use in talking about an animal after having heard it bray.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to have the Senator catechise me as to the property I hold and the cash I have and the votes I have cast until he is black in the face. I have no treasures except treasures in heaven, and nothing to fight except the iniquities of the Republican Party and such scandalous situations as this.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that if his treasures are all in heaven his income tax will not be a burden upon him.

Mr. STANLEY. Absolutely not. But I would not trade my peace of mind for all the sheep the Senator owns.

Mr. BURSUM. The Senator would not have much if he had them all.

Mr. CARAWAY. Anyway, we would find out just how many sheep the Senator does own if he would let us pass the resolution. I want to say to the Senator from Idaho that the resolution contemplates every article that appears in the tariff bill. Whether it is sheep, rice, cotton, sugar, or whatever the article is, it covers the whole field. I believe that when it is done and the American people see by what interests certain schedules were adopted the proponents of the bill themselves would move a reconsideration of it, because there is a power in public opinion—the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Oregon seem to doubt it—but there is such a power in public opinion that it compels people to right wrongs, and I say it is wrong to legislate to put money in the pocket of one individual when it is taken out of somebody else's pocket. Tariffs do not create wealth; they transfer it. If \$40,000,000—because that is about the duty the woolgrowers will get—has been put in their pockets at a cost of \$200,000,000, according to most conservative estimates, that \$200,000,000 has to come out of somebody else's pocket. Tariff does not create it. It does not coin it. It transfers it, and public opinion will not stand for it.

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is it not true that that applies to all tariffs, in the estimation of the Senator? The Senator would have all free trade, except as to a duty on rice.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let the Senator state his own position.

Mr. STANFIELD. The point I am seeking to bring out is the fact that the Senator is entirely opposed to any protective duty.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me tell the Senator what I am opposed to. I am not entirely opposed to a duty on a revenue basis, though some of my votes I might not be able to defend on that basis. I am perfectly willing for the Senator, after he knows what my views are and what my motives are, to call the attention of the world to them, but I am unalterably opposed and would be opposed to what is being done here. I would rather surrender my seat in this body and go back to the people who sent me here than by a vote of mine to take one dollar out of their pockets and put it in my own. I would not do it. I did not inherit wealth and I shall take none with me. I did inherit a good name, and, so help me Almighty God, I shall attempt to keep it. I do not believe any man has a right to take advantage of an official position to enrich himself at the expense of his Nation.

Mr. STANFIELD. Neither do I believe he should, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then we should pass the resolution and find out.

Mr. STANFIELD. For that purpose, and neither am I going to object to the Senator's resolution; but here is the question I want to ask the Senator from Arkansas: If he did believe in a protective tariff, would he not believe that an industry is entitled to protection to the extent of the difference in the cost of production in a foreign country that comes in competition with the American production, and the cost of production in our own country?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; I would believe that.

Mr. STANFIELD. If the Senator believed in it, would he not apply that principle?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, yes.

Mr. STANFIELD. I will say to the Senator that the woolen schedule does not afford that protection. It does not even afford the difference in the cost of labor. I want to say, just to show my position, that I do not believe, whether a Senator happened to be interested in sheep or owns sheep, that that has been the motive which is impelling him to vote for the woolen schedule. He has voted for the woolen schedule, because he realizes the industry in America can not exist with a lesser protection. I want to say to the Senator that the duty imposed has left a large margin to be absorbed by the efficiency of the American producer over the foreign producer.

I want to say, further, in explanation, because I do not believe the Senator has given it thought, that if he will give to the American wool producer the same conditions, so far as labor is concerned, that exist in the rest of the world, the American can produce wool without a protective tariff. Let him go out into the world and hire the same labor that they hire in Patagonia and Australia and New Zealand, and he can produce wool here without protection. But I say that whenever that is done the Senator is going to lower the American standard of living; he is going to take away from the great American laborer the right to live as he does live, and he will have to live as people live in those foreign countries. So it is not the producer selfishly contending for himself, but he is contending to see that protection is given to the American laborer to enable him to live upon the American standard of living.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, I might go into an argument of whether he is doing that or whether he is protecting selfish interests, which would lead nowhere. The Senator from Oregon wholly misses the point. I presume he believes that wool got no more than it was entitled to receive. The question is, Shall a man sit in judgment upon his own case? Shall he determine whether he is being fairly treated and vote to treat himself fairly according to his own ideas, although it costs millions of dollars to other people who differ with him in opinion?

If the Senator could affect only himself by his vote and put money in his pocket without taking it from somebody else, I presume there would not be anybody complaining, but when he takes money from the other 110,000,000 American people or makes them freeze in winter in order to enrich the man who has sheep, then the man who owns the sheep ought not to decide the question in controversy.

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. STANFIELD. The point that I was attempting to bring to the Senator's mind a moment ago was that the one interested in an industry is not concerned about himself nor his interest in the industry; he is concerned about the industry for the benefit of the whole American people.

Mr. CARAWAY. I can not concede that, of course.

Mr. STANFIELD. I had hoped the Senator would be fair and concede that.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let us say that a judge who was interested in a case before him would be absolutely honest. Lord Bacon's defense for accepting bribes was that they never changed his verdict; that he accepted bribes, but was not influenced thereby. But posterity has not accepted his excuse for being a bribe taker. A judge who sat in judgment on his own case might say, "So help me God, I rendered a verdict according to the law and the evidence," but the Senate would impeach him for having done it.

I say that we ought not to be more jealous of the honor of other people than we are of our own. The Secretary of the Treasury has to divest himself, before he can become the Secretary of the Treasury, of all banking and commercial interests. Many Cabinet officers have to do the same thing, because Congress has said that they must—not that we presume a man would be interested and therefore be biased, but for public decency we said, "You shall not be a Cabinet officer, you shall not be Secretary of the Treasury and be interested in banks which are controlled and affected by the Treasury." We create commissions here and make their members swear that they are not interested in matters which they are going to consider as members of the commission. No Senator would vote to confirm a man as interstate commerce commissioner who owned stock in a railroad. He might be able truthfully to swear that his ownership of the stock would not bias him at all, and yet we would say it was abhorrent to public policy to let him sit in judgment and raise or lower rates on property in which he himself was financially interested.



If it is wise and if it is right that we should guard other people, if we shall say they shall not be suspected of being influenced by their selfish interests and therefore we make them disclaim, before they enter upon their duties, that they have any interests of that kind, shall we, then, who create those conditions for other men, say that we rise above them, that we will disregard public opinion, that we will disregard what we think to be wise for other people and say we will vote money into our own pockets, and nobody shall have the right to complain? It is abhorrent, and we can not afford to do it.

Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to introduce a resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask that the resolution be reported.

Mr. CARAWAY. I want it reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

Mr. CARAWAY. Just a moment, and then I shall yield the floor. I want the resolution read, and then the Senator may have the floor.

Mr. BURSUM. I shall only occupy the floor a moment.

Mr. CARAWAY. I want the Senator to have a chance to say whatever he pleases, but I want to have the resolution read first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Whereas it has been charged both on the floor of the Senate and in the public press that Senators whose names have been mentioned are financially interested in the rates of duty proposed in certain schedules of the pending tariff bill; and

Whereas it is also charged that Senators are, or were, financially interested in the passage or extension of the so-called emergency tariff act; and

Whereas these charges are hurtful to the honor of those Senators and to that of the Senate itself: Therefore

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate or a subcommittee appointed by the committee be, and is hereby, authorized and instructed to investigate said charges and to report its findings to the Senate within 10 days. Said committee is hereby instructed to ascertain:

First, whether any Senator is or has been financially or professionally interested in the production, manufacture, or sale of any article or articles mentioned in either of said tariff bills, and if so, to what extent.

Second, whether any Senator represents or is connected professionally or otherwise, directly or indirectly, with any person, firm, association, or organization engaged in the manufacture, production, or sale of any of said articles, or has been so interested during the pendency of this bill or the emergency tariff bill.

The committee is authorized to administer oaths, subpoena witnesses, send for persons or papers in the prosecution of said investigations, and to employ stenographers and to pay for the services therefor not to exceed \$1.25 per printed page of said testimony, all expenses of said investigation to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the introduction of the resolution?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I object to its introduction and to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, this whole proceeding seems to me to be ridiculous—

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, I would say, if I may—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM] has the floor.

Mr. BURSUM. And is giving undue recognition to matters which are of daily occurrence and which are indulged in by the opposition press every day in the year. It seems to me that it is tainted with an attempt to capitalize partisanship and to inject politics.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator from Iowa, the present President pro tempore of the Senate, in 1913 introduced a resolution from which the resolution which I have introduced was copied. That resolution was passed by the Senate when it was Democratic. The investigation was had. If to introduce this resolution now is partisan, was it not partisan when the Senator from Iowa introduced such a resolution?

Mr. BURSUM. Very likely it was. The Senator from Arkansas is not the only gentleman who has the privilege, and who enjoys it and takes advantage of it, of indulging in partisanship and in capitalizing such things. He is very smart and very adroit in such procedure.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] repeat what he said? I did not quite catch it.

Mr. CARAWAY. I said that the senior Senator from Iowa introduced a resolution in 1913 of which the resolution which I have introduced is a copy. The resolution then introduced by

the Senator from Iowa was passed by the Senate and an investigation was had.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, surely. Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Chair, as I remember it, entered into an investigation upon that subject, and the committee compelled every Senator to inventory all his possessions, in order to ascertain whether or not he had any property that was likely to be affected by any kind of legislation.

Mr. BURSUM. And there was not a mother's son of you disfranchised from that day to this; so I suppose that you were all paupers and did not have anything.

Mr. CUMMINS. I was a member of the committee that conducted the investigation.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator from Iowa introduced the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator from Iowa introduced the resolution asking for an investigation of the so-called lobby. President Wilson had charged that there was a lobby here, and the Senator from Iowa introduced a resolution to investigate whether that charge was true or false. The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] then proposed an amendment to the resolution which had been introduced by the Senator from Iowa to inquire into the fact as to whether or not any Senator was interested in the tariff bill then pending.

Mr. CARAWAY. The original resolution was amended, and of that amended resolution the one I have introduced is a copy.

Mr. CUMMINS. At any rate, we conducted an investigation I think requiring months—I do not remember just how long—

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it was about three months.

Mr. CUMMINS. And when it is understood that we were inquiring into all the property that every Senator owned, it may be appreciated that it would take quite a while.

Mr. CARAWAY. It would not take long if they have not got more than I have.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BURSUM. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor. I should like to have just a moment in order to make an observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor, and he has yielded to the senior Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. I desire to point out to the Senator from Iowa that the Senator from New Mexico has just stated that both the resolution of the Senator from Arkansas and the resolution of the Senator from Iowa were presented for partisan purposes. The Senator from New Mexico made that declaration, but I do not think the Senator from Iowa heard it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was here when the investigation referred to was conducted—

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the resolution which I presented was not for partisan purposes. Whatever may have been the character or tinge of any other resolution that has ever been offered in the Senate, the resolution I offered was not for partisan purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thought the Senator from Iowa ought to be advised as to what the Senator from New Mexico had stated.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Mexico will accept that explanation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. BURSUM. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as I was about to say a moment ago, I was present and testified before the committee created by the resolution of the Senator from Iowa; but what did the investigation amount to? It amounted, as all similar investigations do, to a heavy draft on the Treasury of the United States; and that is all the resolution now proposed will amount to if it should be adopted. It will simply fill up pages of the record of the committee, and result in a little notoriety, perhaps, for some "holier than thou" man, and probably enable it to be proved to the Senate that the only men who are eligible to the Senate are the hoboes who ride on the brake beams of freight trains and who, when the train runs through some village, go to some near-by farm to get a free meal.

How many Senators are there here who are not interested in some property somewhere? Shall they be debarred from voting upon this measure? If the farmers of this country are interested in this legislation, are they to be debarred from representation here?

I have no objection whatever to the resolution which has been offered, or any other similar resolution, except I am tired of having to accept demands from the disbursing officer for

hundreds of thousands of dollars for these damn-fool, non-sensical investigations called for from time to time.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, the Senator no doubt thinks it is a damn-fool resolution. It is much more to his way of thinking that you may conceal your interest and profit by it. I should not have said an unkind thing if he had not seen fit to start it. He says that if certain sentiments were to prevail nobody but hoboos would sit in the Senate. I sometimes doubt if the country would be much worse off if the membership of the Senate were composed of hoboos than when it is composed of millionaires. People have a right to sit in the Senate whether they are rich or poor, although rich people do not sometimes think so, and it thoroughly angers the Senator from Wyoming that anybody who is not among the rich questions what the rich do.

That may be good politics; I do not know and I do not care; it may be altogether according to the standards that the Senator from Wyoming sets up for human conduct; I do not care as to that, and neither do I care whether or not the Senator thinks the resolution I have introduced is a damn-fool resolution. I shall entertain the same opinion about it that I had before, although I shall not entertain quite the same opinion about the Senator from Wyoming that I had before he used the expression. I do not care who profits by it; I know that it is morally indefensible for a man to get the confidence of his people and to be elected to office and then use that office to enrich himself, and I do not care whether he is from Wyoming or any other State.

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I dare say, so far as the subject that has been discussed is concerned, probably, if the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators who are here went before their constituencies and made it an issue in their reelection, that their constituencies would stand by them and show their confidence in them.

Mr. CARAWAY. Suppose the constituency of the Senator from Wyoming did say, "You can go back there and enrich yourself at the expense of everybody else," does that make it right?

Mr. STANFIELD. That, however, is not the point I am making.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is the question we were discussing—whether it is right to enrich yourself through the medium of legislation.

Mr. STANFIELD. That is not the question.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is the point I was discussing with the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, it does not seem to me that we are getting very far in this discussion.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, no; the resolution has been objected to.

Mr. BURSUM. As I said a few moments ago, the whole proceeding seems to me an undue capitalization of a matter which is unimportant, for the reason that it is of daily occurrence and is indulged in by the opposition press every day in the year. Without reflecting on anyone, it reminds me—

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURSUM. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does he yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not ask the Senator to yield. I rise to a point of order. I ask the Chair to enforce the rule that no Senator shall speak oftener than twice on the same subject in one day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I have the floor. This proceeding reminds me very much of a Chinese poem which, when translated, reads as follows:

In speech he is a wonder,  
How small are his games;  
How loud is his thunder,  
How little it rains!

Mr. CARAWAY. May I just say that so long as an objection can save its raining it will not rain.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico and Mr. GOODING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I would not rise solely for the purpose of referring to the matter which has been under discussion, but it leads me to some thoughts regarding the general subject. I was interested some years ago in the production of wool; but in 1904 I disposed of all the interest which I had, and have not had any interest in wool production since. I may state further that when I disposed of my interest I just about got a return of the capital invested in the enterprise. I did acquire, however, some personal knowledge of the industry. During those years I became acquainted with the adverse condition under which wool is produced in this country; I realized the effect of drought, the effect of severe winters, and of the extremely unstable markets. I can state that even with the protection accorded by the pending bill the business of the woolgrower will still be speculative; there is no assurance that even with such duties upon imports the wool-producing industry of the country is going to be prosperous, although, in my judgment, the duties will add to the chances of his prosperity.

I was very glad to support the emergency tariff law. I had something to do with the framing of that law. I was also very glad, when the time came to continue the emergency tariff law in operation, to suggest that it be continued not for an unlimited time but until otherwise supplanted or modified by law, and with that modification that law is permanent to-day. I had this thought especially in mind when that proposal was made that it would put the woolgrowers of this country in position to inveigh against exorbitant taxation and tariffs upon manufactured products.

The emergency tariff law reasonably took care, so far as legislation can do it, of the agricultural interests of this country. It is true there was not a tariff upon hides. The Senate put such a tariff duty in the bill upon my motion; but in conference the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] succeeded in having the tariff upon hides removed. After the war agricultural conditions in this country were alarmingly depressed, and those conditions largely prevail to-day. While the prices of manufactured products have gone down somewhat, they have not gone down to anything like the same extent as the prices of agricultural products. The prices of manufactured products to-day, as compared with the pre-war prices, are 72 per cent above the prices of 1913 and 1914, while the prices of agricultural products, and particularly the meat products of the country, are to-day only a little—about 10 or 12 per cent—above the prices of 1913 and 1914.

It is true that the price of wool has rallied; the price of wool has increased beyond the 1913 price, and, in my judgment, it should be largely attributed to the emergency tariff law; but still the prices of wool are not above the pre-war price to the same extent as the prices of hundreds and thousands of manufactured commodities.

There are some farm products which can not be benefited by a tariff. In my judgment, a tariff has little influence upon any farm product with the exception of wool; but after the war the farming industries of this country were laboring under such depression that I felt that I was willing to prescribe any remedy which the farmer might think would benefit him.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BURSUM. The newspaper referred to by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], the News, refers to my colleague as being one of the millionaires created out of the raising of sheep and wool.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have stated, Mr. President, that if I made anything out of wool it was a very small amount, and that was more than 18 years ago.

After the war a campaign was started over this country in favor of a high protective tariff. There existed almost universally throughout this country what I believe to be a mere superstition that the tariff will benefit any product on which it is placed. It is not so; it can not be so; but if by the passage of an emergency tariff law we could improve even the psychological situation of the country, I was in favor of it. I wanted to relieve the minds of the farmers and producers of this country. If there is any benefit to be derived from a protective tariff or any tariff, why should not the farmers of the country get it?

If we look over the history of this country of ours, we see wealth concentrated in a few centers and sections of the coun-



try. It has been brought about largely through the favoritism of protective tariffs.

I think the tariff bill has advanced the price of wool. As to the revenue, why should we not be willing to raise revenue by a tax upon imported wool at least as high as upon many other commodities? There are manufactured products in this bill, hundreds and thousands of them, where the revenue derived from the tariff amounts only to a nominal sum. We import at least one-half the wool consumed in this country, and the Treasury of the United States is largely benefited by a tariff upon wool. Such can not be said of hundreds and thousands of manufactured articles. The tariff is put there for the express purpose of creating a monopoly in this country, to prevent any imports; and time and again in the discussion of this bill, when Senators have been called upon to tell why we ought to have a tariff on some manufactured article, they have referred to the fact that some infinitesimal amount of the commodity was being imported. When this thing is going on, when this orgy of tariff raising is rampant, why should not the farmers of this country get some benefit from it, if there is any benefit to be had? The same thing may be said of the mining interests of the country.

I think the time has come when we ought to take into consideration the welfare of the whole country. I think my good friend from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] has gone too far. By giving up the emergency tariff law and voting for these high protective duties upon manufactured products he has been voting so as to injure the farming interests of this country. Why not keep the present emergency law, rather than pass this infamous bill, which is increasing by enormous amounts the duty upon manufactured products where no further protection is needed, where it will have the effect of increasing the prices of these commodities to the consumer, where it will have the effect of making the farmers of this country surrender to the manufacturers of the country what little benefit they received through the emergency tariff law?

There is no better index to what this bill proposes than what was stated by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] in the discussion of the bill. When I was discussing putting sheep shears upon the free list he said that the woolgrowers had a tariff upon wool, and he thought they ought to give some of their gains to the manufacturer of shears whether the industry needed it or not. He did not, of course, use the latter part of my expression, but that is what his expression meant, and that runs all through this bill—that while a few agricultural producers may get some benefit from the emergency tariff there is a combined and concerted effort here to take that benefit away from them and give it to the manufacturing interests of this country, simply because they have put a tariff upon some of these agricultural products.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. As I understand the Senator's argument, it is that those who are really interested in the welfare of the farmers should vote to substitute the emergency law for this bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the emergency law will remain the law of the land if this bill is not passed.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. They should vote against this bill and therefore permit the emergency law to remain in force?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If they consider the interests of the agricultural producers of the country, in my judgment they should.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thought the emergency law provided that it should no longer be operative after the passage of this bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is quite true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So that if this bill is not passed, the Senator claims that it will continue in operation?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If this bill is not passed, the emergency tariff law will continue in effect.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And of course the tariff on wool would then be about 60 cents a pound.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. There would then be a tariff of 15 cents a pound upon wool in the grease and of 45 cents a pound upon scoured wool.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And, of course, having in mind the "joker" clause, the rate would be very much higher on the clean content.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. No; there is no "joker" clause in the emergency tariff bill that I know of. The old skirting clause of the Payne-Aldrich law was removed specifically by the terms of the emergency tariff law.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator claim that under the emergency law the duty on wool is higher or lower than under this bill?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. As to perhaps 80 or 90 per cent of the wool grown in this country, the duty under this bill is less than it is under the emergency tariff law.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So the real friends of the woolgrowing industry would serve them best by voting to retain the emergency law?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, it is hard to make an unqualified answer, because the different classes of wool receive different rates of duty under the respective laws, and it is really difficult to answer that; but so far as the fine wools of the country are concerned there is more protection under the emergency law than under this law.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator will please pardon me for interrupting him. I simply wanted to bring out the fact that he thinks the emergency law is a better tariff law for the farmers than the pending bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It is for all those who raise fine wool, in my judgment, and that is quite evident from the remark which has been made here by different Senators. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and others have referred to the fact that there are 107,000,000 pounds of wool in bond in the warehouses of Boston to-day awaiting the passage of this bill so as to come in at the lower rate of duty under this bill than that of the emergency tariff law.

Mr. President, so far as the farmers of this country are concerned, this bill simply means an increase in the cost of what the farmer has to buy. Take the present tariff upon meats, the emergency tariff upon meats. It has operated to the interest of the meat producers of this country in a way, but only in a very limited extent. There is no meat now coming into the United States which would make necessary an increase in the duty on meats. This bill proposes to do it, and I have voted for it, because if we are going to raise these tariffs higher and higher upon the manufactured products of the country, why not do so in the case of the agricultural products?

So far as wheat is concerned, the tariff has very little influence upon it. The hard spring wheat of the Northwest may be to some extent advantaged by the tariff upon wheat; but this bill reduces the duty upon that wheat, so how can any wheat grower of the country claim any advantage under this bill? As to the wheat grower, this bill simply means increased costs of everything he has to buy, and why should the wheat grower favor this bill rather than the present law?

The same thing may be said of the bean growers. The duty under this law is precisely the same as in the emergency tariff law, so as to the bean grower the only effect is to increase the price of the things which he has to buy.

The tariff can not affect the price of corn in this country to any substantial extent, but if it does the tariff upon corn in the pending bill is no greater than that in the present law. So why should the corn producer favor this bill? Its only effect as to him would be to increase the price of everything he must buy.

So with the other commodities. There have been a few changes here and there, but in my honest judgment there is no reason on earth why anyone who has the real agricultural interests of this country at heart should vote for this bill in preference to the existing law, including the emergency tariff law.

I hope the Senators on the other side who say they are speaking in the interest of agriculture will bear these things in mind. I come from an agricultural section of the country. I voted for the emergency tariff law; I helped frame it, and I helped continue it until it should be supplanted by some other law; but in my humble judgment, by repealing that law, as this bill does, by substituting these enormous duties upon manufactured products, as this bill does, for the rates in that bill, anyone who votes for the pending bill will be voting against the interest of the agricultural producers of the country.

Mr. SMOOT. "Consistency, thou art a jewel." I want simply to call attention to the fact that there are 17 Democratic Senators who have voted for these so-called "indefensible" rates wherever the products on which those rates were placed were produced in the States which they represent. I am not that kind of a protectionist. I believe in the policy of protection. I believe that this country can not live without it. I believe in it so strongly, Mr. President, that it makes no difference to me where an industry is located, or whether it be agriculture, whether it be the manufacture of any article whatever; whether it be located in the North, in the South, in the East, or in the West. As far as I am concerned, I believe those industries ought to be protected, so that if there are other places in the world which can produce the goods at costs

low enough to result in the destruction of those industries in the United States, I want them to be protected to that limit, and no more.

I do not believe in embargoes. I voted against the embargo presented in this bill on dyestuffs. I was opposed to it, and will be to the end. I do not believe in a rate of duty which would act indirectly as an embargo, but I can not understand a Senator who will vote for a duty upon a product of the farm, or a product which may be produced in his State, the product requiring further manufacturing processes in the different stages before it can be disposed of, refusing to give a compensatory duty for the duty imposed upon the raw material, so called. There is no consistency in that at all, and I can not justify any such vote.

I did not expect to say even this much, but I looked over the list of those Senators voting as stated and saw the articles on which rates have been imposed and voted for by Members on the other side, which Democratic Members have vociferously denounced as indefensible rates of duty, and then, in the very next paragraph, on an article not produced in their State, in which their people are not interested, they vote against even a compensatory duty for the duty they have placed upon the raw product. I say that such action is inconsistent.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, first let me say that I want to congratulate Senators on the other side of the Chamber who have courage enough to vote for the industries of their States, and I care not whether it be rice, peanuts, wool, long-staple cotton, graphite, or anything else. It shows to me that, after all, when it comes to the interest of their own people they know and understand that protection is a blessing to their States. I understand, of course, that under the party lash, working under a Democratic platform which declared that protection is unconstitutional, as it has done for a hundred years, all of them can not see their way clear to go the full length of the matter. But I say in all sincerity, and I say it to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], who saw a little village spring up in his State where there was a graphite mine, who saw a schoolhouse there, with happy children, who saw a people prosperous, an industry which had been developed by the war, because that gave it protection on account of lack of transportation to bring graphite from the mines of foreign countries. As soon as the war was over, and ocean transportation became normal, he saw that little mining camp go down, the schoolhouse was closed, every house was deserted, and if there was any wild game in that neighborhood it stalked through that deserted village.

I have seen just such things as that happen in the mining camps of the West when there has been a lack of proper protection. It never entered my mind that the Senator from Alabama had an interest in that graphite mine. I believed his heart was touched with sympathy, and I knew it was, for people who had once been happily engaged in that industry and were thrown out of an occupation, and are no doubt struggling now to keep the wolf from the door. I never had such a feeling in regard to any other Senator who had the courage to vote for protection for an industry of his State. Never once did it come to my mind that he was doing it for any selfish purpose.

Of course, I know that if something unpleasant had to happen on the other side for the political advantage of the Democratic Party the junior Senator from Arkansas would be the first to take up the matter.

I plead guilty to owning a few sheep. We would call them a few out West; they would not be called a few down here. Sheep raising has been my life's work, almost from boyhood. The people of Idaho knew I owned sheep when they elected me, and, as I remember it, I lead the ticket in majorities. There is no question of doubt about my people understanding that I was a woolgrower, and that I would fight for that industry to the last ditch, because without it my State can not exist. Without the live-stock industry—I will include sheep and cattle—the great West can not go on, and so I am going to fight, and I am going to insist that this resolution be passed, and that this investigation which the other side is so keen to have, for political purposes, proceed in an orderly and proper manner.

For weeks I have known that the importers were spreading propaganda all over this country, just as the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Arkansas intends to do, and I am ready for that investigation. If I have violated any law in voting for the industries of my State, I am ready to resign, and, by the eternal gods, I will resign. I have held public office before, and have always been able to lie down with my conscience clear, and go to sleep, and I know that when I get through with this job in the United States Senate I shall be able to sleep with a clear conscience.

Of course, if there was any reflection to be made on an honest man for political purposes, if there was one man in the Senate who would be more ready to do it than any other, it would be the junior Senator from Arkansas.

There are 700,000 woolgrowers in America, and I believe it is safe to say that 95 per cent of the Senators on this floor own property of some kind or other that is affected by this bill. I think it is safe to say that 80 per cent of them own land upon which farm products are grown. God forbid that the day shall come when the Senate and the House will be filled with men who do not own property in their own rights.

Maybe the Senate is not functioning in the interest of the people as fully and forcibly as it ought to be, but when the time comes—and I do not mean this as any reflection upon the great profession of the law—when all the Members of this body are lawyers, and not a business man is to be found here, God pity the American people. There is no question about their honesty, but their whole life's work has led them along such lines that not all of them have had an opportunity to know, after all, what is for the best interest of humanity in this country. They think they know.

Nobody has any greater regard for them and respect for them than I, but if it must come to a time when a man must not have property in this body and only lawyers serve here, or men who have not had energy enough in this life to accumulate property, ah, this great American Republic will go down to decay.

I am not going to take up a great deal of the time of the Senate, but I say again that I am going to insist that the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Arkansas be passed, because for weeks it has been whispered around the Capitol Building that I was interested in the wool pool and that for that reason I was pushing a tariff on wool. Is there a Senator here who will say I have not fought just as hard for peanuts and for rice and for soya beans and for vegetable oils and for the manufacturers as I have for wool?

No Senator must say that I have not, for it would not be true. In my efforts to secure proper protection I have not known any North or South, East or West. I have stood for every industry because I believed in the great American principle of protection. There never has come to my mind at any time any thought of dishonesty on the part of any Senator voting for any schedule upon this floor. But I want the investigation to be made, because if I have violated my oath of office in trying to protect the industries of my State there will be a vacancy in this Chamber, so far as I am concerned.

I want the American people to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. At some future time I shall pay my respects to the importers and some of the great newspapers for their outrageous attack upon my integrity because I have had the courage to do my duty as I saw it toward the great agricultural industry of this country.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho made reference to the vote I cast on the graphite item of the bill. I have explained to the Senate—

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me a moment, he need not explain further.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand.

Mr. GOODING. The Senator raised himself in my estimation by that vote. When he voted for graphite I felt that he had a heart.

Mr. HEFLIN. I was not quarreling with the Senator from Idaho about his reference to me.

Mr. President, I stated at the time that I believed in a tariff for revenue. I am not a free trader. I stated at that time that graphite had no tariff upon it whatever; that the graphite produced in foreign countries had come in without paying any revenue and had taken possession of the home market and literally closed the graphite mines in the United States. The mines in my State were closed and the people who were working in those mines lost their employment. I wanted our Government to derive some revenue from graphite coming in from foreign countries, and if that tariff incidentally helped the graphite industry in my State and in other parts of the country, all well and good.

Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING], commenting upon the resolution offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], intimated that the Senator from Arkansas did not want anybody in this Chamber unless he was a pauper. That is not the position of the Senator from Arkansas.

The Senator from Arkansas does not care how much property a man in this body has if he came by it honestly and is faithful to his oath of office, is one who safeguards the interest of the



people of the United States, and is one who does not use his position and power to feather his own nest or put money in his own pocket. I think that is the position of the Senator from Arkansas. It is well and good to have Senators in this body representing the various stratas of society, but, Mr. President, it is not well for the country to fill this body up with millionaires, and I do not care whether they are wool kings, flockmasters, trust magnates, or tariff barons. It is not well to fill this body with men of great wealth. No man should be elected to membership here who is lacking in human sympathy and a knowledge of the science of government.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. GOODING. I want to say to the Senator that the newspapers do me entirely too much honor when they mention me as being a millionaire. I would not object to being a millionaire, but, unfortunately, through conditions which have existed, I have a pretty hard fight myself, not to keep the wolf from the door but to pay my debts, and unless conditions improve in the West I shall be fortunate if I am able to liquidate.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator is not by himself. There are millions in his class under this Republican administration. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOODING. I want to say to the Senator that this happened to me under a Democratic administration and free wool.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have told the Senator from Idaho and others on the other side of the Chamber frequently that in spite of free wool, when the Democrats were in power every industry in the country prospered, and we never had any fall down in the business of wool until deflation was started by the Federal Reserve Board under a resolution that was passed by a Republican Senate. Now they are undertaking to tax the whole American people for the benefit of the wool kings of the country. I want to say to the Senator from Idaho that the Tariff Commission right here in Washington in its report said that the wool industry was injuriously affected by the Federal Reserve Board's policy when it determined to contract the currency and deflate credits.

Mr. President, I have not heard the Senator from Idaho lift his voice against the reappointment of the present governor of the Federal Reserve Board, and I want to comment just briefly upon that. Of course, I expect him to vote against his confirmation, if his name should by any hook or crook be sent to the Senate.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I request that order be maintained on the Democratic side of the Chamber.

Mr. HEFLIN. I thank my friend from New Mexico. He is one of the wool kings to whom I have reference. I appreciate his kindly interest in this side of the Chamber. This side of the Chamber is in perfect order, and it wants an investigation of wool kings, including the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BURSUM. I hope the Senator appreciates the fact that kings have been very unpopular in the last few years and some of them have been beheaded. I hope the Senator does not intend to behead us because we happen to be shepherds.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am not in favor of beheading them literally, but I am in favor of beheading them politically. I think it would be a good thing for the country to have them beheaded politically.

Mr. BURSUM. We will get to that next November. But what about my colleague from New Mexico [Mr. Jones]? Would the Senator from Alabama like to have him beheaded politically?

Mr. HEFLIN. The other Senator from New Mexico made the statement that he did not belong in that class and had not made anything out of wool in about 18 years, or words to that effect. Now I should like to hear the real wool kings here testify who are voting money into their own pockets when they place a high tariff tax on wool.

Mr. President, I desire to speak for a little while about another matter. I am going to read an interesting document about the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, about a newspaper man being on the Federal reserve pay roll, naming one and asking about others. I have been suggesting for some time to the Senate that I would read this statement.

I have a letter here from a prominent banker which says that on page 3049 of Who's Who in America, edition of 1920-21, there is a biographical sketch of H. Parker Willis, economist, born at Weymouth, Mass., August 14, 1874, from which the following is quoted:

Associate editor New York Journal of Commerce, 1912-1914, and editor same 1919.

That means that he was an associate editor of the Journal of Commerce from 1912 to 1914, when he ceased the duties as associate editor, and after an interval of five years he went back to the newspaper as editor and was still editor when the 1920-21 edition of Who's Who was printed. The same sketch then proceeds:

Secretary Federal Reserve Board, Washington, 1914-1918, and director of research same 1918.

That means, the letter continues, that Doctor Willis was secretary of the Federal Reserve Board from 1914 to 1918, and that when he ceased to be secretary he took the job of director of research in 1918 and was still holding the job when the 1920-21 edition of Who's Who was printed.

On page 257 of the annual report of the Federal Reserve Board for the year 1920 we find the name of H. Parker Willis listed as director of analysis and research and drawing a salary of \$6,000 a year. Is he drawing that salary now? Has it been increased or reduced? If he is the editor of the Journal of Commerce, as is asserted in his biographical sketch in Who's Who, and is also on the pay roll of the Federal reserve system at a salary of \$6,000 a year, as the Reserve Board said that he was in 1920, we can very well understand why the editorial columns of the Journal of Commerce are so earnest in their defense of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. President, I had passed through this body a resolution calling upon the Federal Reserve Board to state whether they had a publicity fund. The governor of that board came back and positively stated that he had no such fund. I said there was some way by which they were getting publicity, there was some way by which they were getting into the newspaper columns, and I said that it must be that they are putting men on the pay roll to do a little research work of this kind and that in order to cover up what they are really paying them for. Are they paying certain newspaper men to get publicity for their views and for refusing to give publicity to those who criticize their official conduct?

Certain banking and speculative interests are making a hard fight just now to have Governor Harding reappointed. All news detrimental to their scheme must be kept in the background. It must not get in the papers. Look at the press gallery now, if you please. Watch those who represent some of the great dailies of the country. Whenever a Senator criticizes the deflation and the Federal Reserve Board on this floor now they leave the gallery instantaneously. They fly away out of sight and hearing like a covey of birds flushed upon the field. Why is it that these grave matters touching the public interest are ignored or suppressed? Who is it that does not want them to reach the people of the country? I am making a charge here to-day that there is an editor of a great daily paper on the pay roll of the Federal reserve system enthusiastically defending the Federal Reserve Board and denying publicity to those who attack it. Look in certain big dailies to-morrow and see if you find an accurate report regarding this matter.

I have a note, written by a gentleman who has been for some time a visitor in the Senate gallery, calling my attention to a certain fact and asking me, "Have you noticed that certain newspaper men get up and leave the gallery whenever a discussion of deflation and the Federal Reserve Board is commenced in the Senate? If you have not noticed it, watch the next time and see what happens." So when I got up this morning and mentioned deflation and said I was going to read something important in reference to it, I looked at the press gallery and saw several very clever gentlemen quietly walking out. I asked my correspondent why that was; why they did that? I was told, "They do it in order that they may say if questioned about it, 'Why, I was not in the gallery when that was said; I did not hear it, and that is why I did not write a story about it.'"

Mr. President, I am fighting a battle here for the good of my country, and the people are entitled to know what we, their public servants, are doing to safeguard their interests. It is wrong to support that portion of the press that will not give to the people both sides of the great questions discussed here.

I wish to refer to another interesting matter in this connection. Some time ago I made the mistake of referring to the Wall Street Journal when I should have said the New York Journal of Commerce. The Journal of Commerce stated editorially that it had declined to print certain material sent to it by the president of the great American Cotton Association, Hon. J. S. Wannamaker. I read excerpts from that editorial on the floor and I confused the Journal of Commerce with the Wall Street Journal. I have apologized to the Wall Street Journal for having done so. It was the Journal of Commerce which refused to take material sent by the head of the great American Cotton Association, which shut out that material and threw it into the wastebasket.

I have found the reason for that. H. Parker Willis, who is or was and may be both, on the Federal reserve pay roll at \$6,000 a year, is one of the editors of the New York Journal of Commerce. Mr. Wannamaker, who is the president of the American Cotton Association, wrote many articles in which he pointed out wherein the deflation policy had been ruinous to the cotton producer. He was giving his side of it; he was asking this great newspaper in New York to carry his views; but all of a sudden that paper stopped printing anything that he wrote and boasted of it in an editorial; it threw his matter into the wastebasket. I wondered why. Now, we find that Mr. Wannamaker was attacking the Federal Reserve Board; and I find that the man who sits in the "holy of holies" in the office of the Journal of Commerce is on the Federal reserve pay roll at a salary of \$6,000 a year. And yet the Federal Reserve Board, without explaining how it is they get publicity, deny that they have a publicity fund.

Mr. President, a few days ago I called the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that Mr. Curtiss, appointed by Governor Harding as the chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, was connected with Harvard University, and that he had probably been influential in securing the degree of LL. D. for W. P. G. Harding. I did not know that any other institution had given him such a degree. But I have secured some more thrilling information. The gentleman who writes me says:

I am advised that Governor Harding has recently obtained a degree of LL. D. from Columbia University, New York.

I thought it was high time that New York was doing something to show its appreciation for what Governor Harding did for the New Yorkers through his deadly deflation policy. I now ascertain that they have annointed him with the degree of LL. D.—this same W. P. G. I find that Dr. H. Parker Willis, who is drawing a salary of \$6,000 a year from the Federal reserve system of which "Doctor" Harding is governor, was lecturer at Columbia University in 1913-14, and that since 1917 and up to the time of the publication of the 1920-21 edition of "Who's Who" he was professor of banking at Columbia University.

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet!" Professor of banking at Columbia University and on the pay roll of the Federal reserve system, aye, and four years secretary to Governor Harding's board, this same H. Parker Willis, who is also now the editor of the New York Journal of Commerce, which is now shutting out material presenting the cotton producers' side of deflation as sent in by the president of the great American Cotton Association, and just now on the home stretch, when they are trying to get W. P. G. Harding reappointed governor of the Federal Reserve Board, they come forth and give him another degree of LL. D.—the aforesaid and same W. P. G.

Senators, what are we coming to in this country? I saw a picture of him participating in the parade which was held as an incident to the ceremony of conferring the LL. D. degree at Columbia University. The head of our great Federal reserve system was walking along, all capped and gowned, with a Chinaman, also capped and gowned, near by in the same parade. A deflation policy so deadly that it destroyed property values by the billions was conducted by the head of the board. It took men's homes away from them; it made them tenants; it took farms away from farmers and turned men out of employment by the millions.

It destroyed property values in America to the extent of more than \$10,000,000,000. New York profited by it. New York made her hundreds of millions and her billions of dollars by that deadly deflation process. Now they are reaching out for every influence at their command in order to boost this man. So they have made him a "doctor of laws." Who was standing by his side, fanning him, and praising him and deflation when he got his degree and his cap and gown on that hot day at Harvard? Mr. Curtiss, intimately connected with Harvard and chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, drawing \$18,000 a year through an appointment given him by this same Governor Harding. Who was with him at Columbia, and said softly, "Lean on me"? Prof. H. Parker Willis, who is on the Federal reserve pay roll at \$6,000 a year, who is editor of the New York Journal of Commerce. He shuts out from the columns of that journal criticisms of the Federal Reserve Board, and boldly takes his stand by his chief while, strange to say, the faculty or board at Columbia consents that the degree of LL. D. shall pass to W. P. G.

Oh, Mr. President, I am sure such performances are not going to deceive President Harding. The wholesale farce in LL. D. degrees has become so ridiculous that some of the poets of America are writing about them and making fun of them. Time was when the man who was given the degree of LL. D. at one

of our great universities had to be a profound scholar, a man of great learning and of superb intellectual powers, and because of these great qualities or achievements the universities would honor him and feel themselves honored by giving him the degree of LL. D.; but it has gotten so now that one can almost get such degrees by subscribing to newspapers and periodicals in a club—of two dailies, one weekly, and an LL. D. degree for \$4 cash. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I want to read to the Senate how such proceedings strike the intelligent mind of the average man and the average woman in the country. S. E. Kiser expressed their views of some of these ridiculous LL. D. performances in the following poem. Listen, Senators. I would that the sheep kings were here:

#### THE DOUBLE ELL DEES.

Buck Bunkerson now is a doctor of laws;  
His manner is proud since he got his degree;  
Lift your hat, if you please, when you meet him, because  
It's a fine thing to bow to a double ell dee!  
Buck Bunkerson's wife has a right to be glad;  
Her hard-fisted husband now ranks with the great.  
Who cares if the English he uses is bad?  
He's the richest egg dealer we have in this State.

[Laughter.]

Oh, Mr. President, these degrees of LL. D. are going easy now.

There Bullwinkle, too, stands among the select;  
If ever you've doubted his wisdom or worth,  
Begin to address him with proper respect;  
His honor is greater than breeding or birth!  
Remember the double ell dee he has won,  
And cease to be jarred by his vulgar displays;  
His beginning was humble; see what he has done;  
His horses run fast and his trolley road pays.

[Laughter.]

LL. D's in this morning of the twentieth century are exceedingly easy to get, Mr. President.

Begosh was another who loomed in the line,  
Looking great in his gown where degrees were conferred;  
His children have something your children and mine  
Will lack all their lives—it is pride, in a word.  
Don't sneer and don't scoff; keep your jealousy down;  
Each garden possesses a prominent toad;  
Begosh is the richest coal man in this town;  
His honor, of course, has been justly bestowed.

[Laughter.]

How thrilling it is, when the college year ends,  
To read how our leaders received their degrees!  
Skaggs gets a degree that surprises his friends,  
For making six millions in doughnuts and cheese;  
Tubbs, Tinker, Gilfeather, De Gass, and Macnell  
Are "doctored" for winning in timber or tea;  
Bobunkus goes through as the king of corn meal—  
Oh, it's great to be tagged with a double ell dee!

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not intend that these disgusting tricks shall be turned without the Congress of the United States, the President, and the country knowing just how they are being done. Senators, the deadly influence of the insidious and dangerous money power is worming itself into everything. Beware! It is time to cry out against it; it is time to stop it. One can not get these attacks on the Federal Reserve Board published in the New York Journal of Commerce. Into the wastebasket they go. One of its editors is on the pay roll of the Federal Reserve Board at \$6,000 a year, we are told; professor of banking at the Columbia University for four years; secretary to Governor Harding, of the board, and is now drawing this salary out of the purse of the American people. LL. D. degrees are showered down upon W. P. G. Harding on every hand just as he is on the home stretch, and the appointment of governor of the Federal Reserve Board is soon to be made.

How alert and enterprising are they who have profited through deflation at the hands of the Federal Reserve Board governor!

Mr. President, this man took the greatest banking system ever devised when it was in the pink of condition and operating to the satisfaction of business of every kind in every section of the country and changed it from a helpful and serviceable agency into an implement of torture and destruction; but those who sat back and clipped their coupons and made their millions pat him on the back and say, "Leave that to us; we will fix all that; we will root out all these impressions in the public mind; we will do such things for you that we will make them think you are really great, anyway. We will have institutions of learning which are mighty in the land give you the degree of LL. D. After all these attacks have been made, after all this ruin has been wrought, and all this history has been written, we will lift you up above all this ruin that you have helped to bring about and crown you with dozens of



LL. D. degrees and clothe you in the splendor and glory that predatory interests alone can bestow. Leave it to us."

But, Mr. President, I have assurances that they will not succeed. I owe it to the Senate, in view of his deflation record since, as this man hails from my State, to fight his reappointment to the uttermost. I am proud of my State; proud of her splendid history and look with perfect faith to a glorious future for her. When a man holding a great position misuses and abuses his power, and by so doing injures not only the people of his own State to the extent of millions of dollars but the people of other sections of the country while sinister interests grow richer and richer upon the distress and misfortune thus produced, I owe it to the whole people to repudiate him.

Mr. President, it is no small offense to take a man—I do not care whether he is a man in small business or in big business—and simply destroy him, take his substance away from him, turn him adrift without a dollar, and shatter his hopes for the future. There are millions, not merely hundreds of thousands, of people who were robbed outright by the deflation policy conducted by the Federal Reserve Board. I would be a hypocrite and a coward and unfaithful to my oath when I said I would defend my country against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, if I should sit silent and permit this thing to pass without characterizing it as it should be characterized, without doing everything in my power to make it so hated and odious that it never will be undertaken again.

Mr. President, I said the other day, and I am going to repeat in conclusion, that 25 years from now, 50 years from now, parties will be referring to the deflation crime of 1920; and the Wall Street buccaneers, the wolves who profited from the distress and misfortune of millions of people of the South and West, are not going to escape the condemnation which is the just and righteous judgment of the people.

What ought posterity to think of me, and especially the people in my State, who honored me, if I should sit silent here because I was afraid of that part of our press known as a subsidized press that would attack me, as it has, and would misrepresent me, as it has? What ought it to think of me if I should fold my arms and say: "I am not going to assail this thing. I know it was a crooked deal; I know it was a crime; I know that it destroyed this man's business; I know that it shut the schoolhouse door to thousands of children out yonder; I know that it made tenants out of home owners, and put adrift farmers who owned their land, and turned people out of employment—all this in order that the wild speculators might, like those at Belshazzar's feast, revel at their own deflation carnival, buying up Liberty bonds and other Government securities for practically nothing, and sitting back enjoying their billions.

New York City, I repeat, never made as much money in the same length of time in all its history as when this dragnet of deflation was working through the South and through the West, to the ruin of my people and your people of the West; and yet every kind of pressure has been brought to bear to silence me because I dared to point out the doings of big crooks in high places. I am indorsed by nearly every honest man and woman in the country. I ought to be commended for my efforts by every newspaper in the United States. Some of them—a good many of them—are commending my course and are doing good service in this important battle.

Mr. President, I am either right or wrong in the fight I am making. If I am right, I am entitled to the support of every honest man and woman in the country. If I am wrong, I ought to be opposed by all of them. I have stated facts from time to time as to what this deflation policy has done, and Senators on the other side, a few of them—my friend from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] in the number—and Senators on this side, a majority of them, including my friends from Georgia, Senators Watson and Harris, tell me: "You are exactly right. They did that same thing to my people. Go on with your fight"; but some of the newspapers have published editorials attacking me. They do not represent the people.

Mr. President, I said once before, and I am going to repeat, that when I am attacked by some of them I regard it as a compliment, because when I am assailed by some of them that I know are the mouthpieces of these corrupt interests I know that I am on the right road.

If they feel that they are to be the tools of these interests, and they want to carry on that sort of work, I suppose they are at liberty to do that; but, Mr. President, there is a wonderful stir going on in this country about a free press just now as surely as you and I live. I have in my possession now some awful editorials, written by strong men, about how susceptible certain papers are to the coin of the realm—how money controls certain newspapers' policies. Time was when you could get news in the columns of certain newspapers and

the editor reserved the right to take issue with your position, to criticize what you had written, or criticize what you had said in a speech that was printed in his paper. A gentleman wrote me not long ago and said, "You can not only get the news columns now in some of these papers, but you can literally buy the editorials as well." He is a very responsible man; he has had a good deal of experience and has been around the world a great deal, and that is his deliberate opinion.

Mr. President, we have two classes in the newspaper business—one of them is honest and the other is dishonest; one of them is subsidized or corruptly controlled and the other is not. That is the situation we have in this country, and we might just as well talk plainly about it.

I am not afraid of the press. I am the firm friend of the honest press. God knows I would not hamper the press in the discharge of its duty, or take away from it any of its rights and privileges to give the news to the people, and print the views of those who own the papers; but I am against the scheme that some of them have of suppressing the news of events of importance that take place right here in this Chamber, around this Capitol, that the people of the country are entitled to know about. Why is it that you never see a line about a lot of important matters discussed in this Chamber?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad to yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. The time is coming when the press will have to be free if it wants to exist. This country can not live and tolerate a press which it knows is a hireling press. It will not pay for such papers. It will not advertise in such papers. People will not buy from those who advertise in such papers, and the worst of the fight is past.

When the espionage law was passed and so many hundreds of newspapers were crushed by arbitrary orders of the Post Office Department freedom of press was more in danger than it ever had been since our Government was established or since Charles Fox, Lord Grey, and John Wilkes had made their noble fight in England for the freedom of the press, and Thomas Erskine had made his glorious fight for trial by jury instead of arbitrary directions of verdicts by judges. That time, if the Senator will allow me, is coming again. The forces of conflict are arraying themselves against each other again. That battle is irresistible. Nothing on earth can stop it and nothing on earth can silence the people. They are going to be heard, or we will have a revolution in this country.

I will say to the Senator from Alabama, for his encouragement, that there was one little press, one little weekly paper, that rode out the storm during the war times. That paper is being sustained without subsidy and without private capital of any sort. The money that sustains it comes from the pockets of the people who pay for it as subscribers. It has almost no advertising. It asks for none on those terms alone upon which advertising could be obtained for such a paper; and I tell the Senator now that there is more demand for such speeches as his than there ever has been before. There is more demand for such attacks as I have made on the Federal Reserve Board, upon the same lines as those which he has used, than ever before. They can not cry us down. They can not answer us. They dare not try to answer us. They need not try to ignore us.

My belief is that in the next congressional election in the South, at least—I can not speak for other sections—the man who dares to stand for the contraction policy of the Federal Reserve Board will take his death warrant in his hands, already signed by himself, and I myself will do all in my power to put that death warrant into effect. No such man has a right to a place in this body, because his heart is not with the people. The very fight which the Senator from Alabama has made here against the Federal Reserve Board Andrew Jackson made against James Biddle, and if he will read those thrilling chapters, written by Van Buren in his old age, he will find that every argument he has made here was made then. If he will read the speeches which Thomas H. Benton made here in the Senate he will find that he has made no speech differing from those made by Benton in the great fight of himself and of Jackson against the old Federal bank.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Georgia for his very valuable suggestions. I rejoice to see him back in his seat again. I am glad that he has gained strength enough from his recent illness to come back to his post of duty, where he can fight the battles of his people.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Georgia proceeded I was reminded by what he said about the fight that was made back

yonder by Jackson to keep the banking system out of politics, and there came to my mind the little poem—

Freedom's battle, once begun,  
Bequeathed from bleeding sire to son,  
Though baffled oft, is ever won.

And that is literally true.

The people in that time won their battle against the banking system that was undertaking not only to control everything in the business world but sought to dominate the political affairs of the Nation. They were stopped. Jackson drove them back out of politics. Am I to be criticized; are both of my friends, the Senators from Georgia, and others to be criticized for fighting this battle to punish those who committed that crime? What do we do to a burglar who breaks into a dwelling house, steals property, and appropriates it to his own use? We stand him up in the court, and the judge scolds and reprimands him as a culprit and punishment is imposed upon him.

What do you do to the man who breaks into a bank and takes the money out of the vault and appropriates it to his own use? You arraign him before 12 jurors, and they punish him for his crime.

What did deflation do? It did more harm to Alabama and the South and West than an invading army could have done. A million burglars turned loose could not have done the harm that the Federal Reserve Board's deflation policy did under the guise of civic authority.

What was ordered to be done? The widow in my State and yours with \$1,500 of Liberty bonds, which she had bought by stinting herself. When deflation came, what happened? Her little farm was swept away. She went to the bank and tried to borrow money on her bonds, and could not get it. The bankers said, "We would like to accommodate you, but we have been instructed not to loan on bonds." What then? She was told that the sharks of Wall Street would buy her bonds. She asked what they would give, and she was told \$80 or \$85 on the hundred.

They got her bonds through deflation. What caused her to have to sell the bonds? Her debt-paying power was destroyed by deflation. What was that? It was a crime against honest business and a crime against this good woman. What did that necessitate her doing? She had to go to the bank with the Liberty bonds. Could she borrow money on them? No; she had to sacrifice them, interest-bearing bonds of the Government, for which she had paid \$100 on the hundred, and was told that they would always be as good as gold. They were sacrificed upon the altar of the greed of Wall Street. Wall Street got them. Then what happened? This woman's business was ruined and she is without a home to-day, and Wall Street has her bonds. They are above par, drawing 4 and 4½ per cent interest.

What is that offense? It is a crime. What is my duty? My duty is to condemn it as a crime. If some man had gone there and stolen \$15 on the hundred out of \$1,500 worth of bonds you would have sent him to the penitentiary; but the bond sharks of Wall Street, through a deflation policy, will steal \$15 on the hundred, and then you want to honor and glorify the man who conducted the deflation thievery that took her money. Then they assail me with a miserable, subsidized press, because I dared to defend right dealing and dared to condemn crooked conduct in a thing like this. I just want to serve notice of them now what will happen. I am not making any criticism on any paper that is not subsidized, and I do not want these clever boys who represent papers at this Capitol—and many of them are exceedingly clever gentlemen—to take any offense at what I say, unless they represent a subsidized paper, for what I say is not intended for them. I am talking about the enemies of my country, papers who are hired character assassins, hired to try to destroy men who stand in this body and fight the crooked conduct of big crooks and the interests they represent. I want to serve notice on them now that they are wasting space in their paper, they are wasting ink, and wasting time, by their attacks upon me. I am going to fight them to the end.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I had intended, but this is the most serious question which confronts the American people by far. It affects very vitally the business life of the Nation. I have heretofore used this illustration, but it comes to my mind, and I am so anxious that all Senators should get it that I will repeat it. I said I would not like to turn the control of the circulation of the blood through my body over to anybody. He might go to sleep or, if these subsidized newspaper fellows had control over it now, they would stop it altogether, and put me out of commission.

It is a serious thing to permit a few men to control the money supply of the country, which is the lifeblood of the business of the country, and let them control the circulation as they see fit.

I quote the Manufacturers' Record when I say that Governor Harding hoarded the lifeblood of the Nation, and would not let it circulate. What a crime! That was said by Richard H. Edmonds, one of the bravest and best of all the brave editors in the country or that the country has ever produced. He indicts this governor of the system for hoarding the Nation's lifeblood and not letting it circulate.

That is the fellow I am condemning, and that is the crime I am condemning. Here is H. Parker Willis on the pay roll of the system, drawing \$6,000 a year, the editor of a great paper that is attacking me because I fight this board's conduct and its deadly deflation policy.

Mr. President, I suppose they would like to have every Senator where they could say to him what was said to the new preacher who came into the community. He said, "I hope you will all be out Sunday night when I preach my first sermon." They said, "We want to start you off right. What line of talk are you going to give us?"

He said, "I am going to preach against sin, as the Bible tells me to do. I am going to preach against sin as my conscience as a Christian man dictates that I should. I am going to condemn sin in the big sinner and the little sinner alike."

They said, "Let us tell you something. You had better give us a little outline of your sermon and let us see whether it is going to suit this settlement or not."

He said, "Gambling at cards leads to other vices. It is a dangerous thing. I knew a young man who started out that way, and he went to ruin."

They said, "Whoa, whoa, you want to cut that all out. The best paying member of this church plays cards, and he plays for big money, and you don't want to offend him. Cut that out."

He said, "I don't like to cut out anything. I don't like to have anybody dictate to me what I shall preach about."

They said, "You cut that out"; and they made him cut it out, and several other things.

So finally they told him of so many things that he should cut out that he said, "Now, you have just about cut everything out of my sermon. What am I to preach about?" One old fellow over in the corner stroked his beard and said, "There is an infernal old infidel here in town, you can turn loose on him. He hasn't got a friend in town."

So, Mr. President, these highbrows, who represent these big interests in Wall Street, and the subsidized press like to take a Senator and start him off right. They pat him on the back and tell him, "You want to lay off of this. It is dangerous, and you will hurt the feelings of men of big wealth, don't you see?" And they try to scare you by telling you that certain men have gone down politically for attacking these big interests. You do not want to say anything about those things, they remind you. Fold your arms and drift. Move against the lines of least resistance. Put your courage aside. Swallow your convictions. Draw your pay. Be a rubber stamp. Do the bidding of the interests. Lead an easy life, and you will have no opposition in the future. We will take care of that. Do you understand? "We will have," they will tell you, "the newspaper publishers tell how smart you are if you will serve us and what a big and wonderful man you are, if you do our bidding." Do you get that? But do not oppose us. If you do, we will fight you. "For what care we for wrongs and crimes, its dimes and dollars and dollars and dimes."

It is high time that some of us were accepting the challenge. Conscious of the righteousness of my position and knowing the people that I represent, I do not fear those interests. I accept the challenge. I would rather go out fighting for what I believed was honest, fair, just, and right and leave to my son and the people who have honored and trusted me a stainless record, one of devotion to duty and fearlessness in its discharge, than to stay here a quarter of a century and be the subservient tool of those whose unbridled corruption, greed, and avarice mean ruin to my country.

That is my position upon this question, and I shall continue the fight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] to strike out paragraph 1110.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, I move, on line 17, page 147, in paragraph 1111, to substitute "50" for "55," so as to read "50 per cent ad valorem."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 147, lines 16 and 17, the committee report, to strike out "36 cents per pound, and, 1½ addi-



tion thereto, 27½," and to insert "45 cents per pound and 50," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 1111. Pile fabrics, cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the whole surface, made of wool or of which wool is a component material, whether or not constituting chief value, and manufactures, in any form, made or cut from such pile fabrics, 45 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, we have come now to the paragraphs which cover, respectively, pile fabrics, blankets, automobile rugs, steamer rugs, felts, knit goods, and so forth. All of these paragraphs involve exactly the same principles we have been discussing. It would be futile for me to reiterate the arguments I have made during the last few days, especially when we were discussing the paragraph dealing with dress goods and wool cloths. It would be irksome and tiresome to the Senate, and all I could do would be to repeat what I have said about the preceding paragraphs, namely, that the duties are excessively high, that the information before us as to the difference in conversion costs does not justify these high duties, and that the importations have not been of a character to threaten the domestic industry. In fact, the importations under the rates named in the Underwood law have been negligible. So far as I am concerned, I am going to hasten action on these paragraphs, have a record vote taken, and have the balance of the wool schedule disposed of this afternoon, if it is possible.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to ask the Senator a question for information. I think the Senator agrees that the compensatory duties are accurately levied upon these goods, but the Senator says that the conversion duty is too high. I have tried to get some evidence upon that. I have no information relating to it later than 1912. I do not think that is very accurate, but it was the best we could get hold of. That would show a difference in the conversion costs at home and abroad reaching all the way from 60 to 80 per cent, but I am well aware that the labor costs in Great Britain and the United States are closer together to-day than they were at that time.

I ask the Senator what he thinks is the difference in the cost of conversion, and what evidence he has which directly bears upon the subject. We put the rate at 50 per cent. If the Senator has anything direct to the point showing that that is erroneous, I would like to get it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I find that I shall have to take some time in discussing this paragraph. The Senator did not pay me much of a compliment by his inquiry. I spent hours in discussing that subject, producing tables and figures to show what were the prices of domestic cloths and the comparable foreign cloths, compared the difference in the prices, and proved, as far as I could prove, that a protective duty of 35 cents was ample. I produced information in regard to tops, worked out by experts, showing exactly to the cent what the conversion cost was and showing that the rate named in the bill was too high. I produced similar evidence from the Tariff Commission, to the effect that the conversion costs of yarns and cloths were not as high now as formerly and that the duties proposed in the bill were too high.

Now I am going to call attention to what the Senator from North Dakota said yesterday, and I am going to ask the Senator, as this is a good opportunity to do it, either to bring me the proof or retract what he said yesterday about information from the Tariff Commission. I want to find out if I have been deceived in this matter by the experts who have been sent to me and have informed me that the Tariff Commission have never made any estimate as to just what protective duty was necessary to protect the American industries making woolen manufactures. The information I have is that the Tariff Commission will prepare tables, give data of imports and exports, prices, and other facts, but that they have never advised the committee as to what rates to levy, and there has been no rate in the bill levied upon the advice of the Tariff Commission.

I am going to read what the Senator said yesterday and what was printed in the press to-day about the rates on cloths. I was not in the Chamber at the time or else I should have called attention to it at once. I refer to what was printed of the Senator's remarks on page 10776 of the RECORD:

We—

Referring to the committee—

had not any very late statistics on that point that were extremely reliable—

Meaning, of course, the conversion costs—

I admit, but we had the statistics under normal conditions, say, in 1912; and taking all the importations at that time we arrived at the fact, and it was so reported by the Tariff Commission, that the differential which would require protection to put the two upon an equal footing was from 60 to 70 per cent, and we gave 50 per cent.

The Senator from North Dakota allowed the impression to go out, and the papers of the country printed it, that the Tariff Commission recommended 60 or 70 per cent and the committee gave only 50 per cent. If the Tariff Commission recommended 60 or 70 per cent, I say to the Senator that he ought to have given 60 or 70 per cent to the woolen manufacturers as well as to give to the woolgrowers the duty which they asked.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator want a reply at this time?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In just a moment. I am going to read what the Tariff Commission said, not in 1912 but in 1920, absolutely refuting the statement made by the Senator yesterday.

Mr. President, I read from a report issued by the Tariff Commission in 1920 entitled "A survey of the British wool manufacturing industry." On page 76 of this report is a table showing the American wholesale price of cloth, such as we were discussing yesterday, under paragraphs 1108 and 1109, and showing the English and American prices per yard. Following that table the Tariff Commission makes the following comment—and remember, this was in 1920, the last word upon the matter—on page 80:

While there are important irregularities among these figures—

Referring to the prices quoted—

certain conclusions are possibly warranted. The tendency for English and American prices to approximate one another, already noted in the case of tops and yarns, is here also evident.

The tendency of American and English prices of woolen cloth to approach each other was in 1920 evident, and yet the Senator from North Dakota had the hardihood to say here yesterday that the Tariff Commission recommended a 60 or 70 per cent protective duty. Let me continue:

Even making allowances for minor variations between the estimates of English values and those actually prevailing, there are obviously cloths of several types with regard to which there is no considerable difference of price existing between the English and American markets, while in some instances the domestic manufacturer really has the advantage.

I am reading from the Tariff Commission, which made a survey of the British wool-manufacturing industry in 1920. These are not my findings of fact:

It is noteworthy in this connection to recall that in a similar, though more comprehensive, comparison made by the Tariff Board in 1911 there was no fabric of which the English price was higher than the American, nor, indeed, any which came nearer than 20 per cent of the American price.

In view of that statement, how can it be said on the floor of the Senate that the Tariff Commission recommended a protection of 60 or 70 per cent and the committee only gave them 50 per cent?

Again, the difference in comparative advantage among the several types of cloth is fairly clear. Values in the two markets are much closer together in the case of serges and cotton-warp dress goods than in that of fancy fabrics. With regard to the former, no importation is possible, at least over the 35 per cent duty of the present tariff law—

With regard to certain classes, no importation is possible with a 35 per cent protective duty—

but for the latter the present rate is entirely inadequate.

That shows that there are some woolen cloths on which the commission thinks the rate of 35 per cent is inadequate, and those, of course, are the fancy cloths.

Just where the dividing line lies and to what extent the domestic production of cloths is of the more self-sufficient types could be determined only by a wide and thoroughgoing inquiry.

That is in the RECORD. I put this evidence in the RECORD when I discussed the paragraph on cloths. Other tables and other information were put in the RECORD. I ask the Senator, in the face of that statement from the Tariff Commission in 1920, where is the evidence before the Finance Committee since 1920 which is to the effect that the Tariff Commission believe that a protective duty of 60 or 70 per cent ought to be levied?

If the explanation of the Senator is that he drew those deductions from the Reynolds report on prices, and when he referred to the Tariff Commission he meant the Reynolds report showing the difference in cost, then it may be possible that he could claim that the value of some cloth in some other part of the world other than England would show a wider difference in prices.

But I want to know, for I do not propose that any Senator shall vote upon the strength of my argument and upon the information furnished to me by the experts of the Tariff Commission until I am answered. I do not propose that the Senator from North Dakota can make the statement he did, that the committee only gave 50 per cent when the Tariff Commission recommended 60 or 70 per cent, without refutation. I wait for the Senator's answer.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield. I am waiting for the Senator's reply.

Mr. McCUMBER. I can answer now or wait until the Senator gets through.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am confining myself to the allegation made by the Senator yesterday, and I am asking the Senator to give me the information which he has, which I have not been able to get, which is to the effect that the Tariff Commission made any such recommendation.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know, Mr. President, just how accurately I expressed myself yesterday, as I did not have time to look over my remarks, but what I attempted to say and what I reiterate to-day is that the conversion costs in the woolen schedule would range from 60 to, I think, almost 100 per cent more in the United States than in Great Britain. In France, I think, the spread would be still greater. I do not mean to say that that means we would have from 60 to 80 per cent upon the cost of the goods which are manufactured to meet that. That would depend entirely upon the price of the goods, and it might average 50 per cent.

This is what the Tariff Commission said, and I am reading from page 75 of the Survey of the British wool-manufacturing industry, which was furnished to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House in 1920. This is what the Tariff Commission say:

In the comparison of commission rates in England and in the United States for the several sections of the wool manufacture, information is too inadequate to permit the formulation of accurate conclusions as to the primary consideration relative to costs of production in the two countries. Such data as have been presented, together with such fragmentary figures on weaving as the commission has been able to secure, suggest that, at least at present, the differences in cost are not as great as they were found to be in 1911 by the Tariff Board. In its report the board stated that the cost of converting wool to tops was approximately 80 per cent higher in this country than in England; that of converting tops to yarns, about 100 per cent higher; and of turning yarns into cloth "for a great variety of fabrics," 100 to 150 per cent greater. The present commission rates for combing in this country have been shown to be not over 40 per cent greater than the current rates in England; those for spinning around 80 per cent; while, for manufacturing proper and dyeing, the data which have as yet been secured indicate that the difference in both cases, except, perhaps, for fancy cloths, would surely be below the low figure in 1911 (100 per cent)—

That is, 100 per cent was given in 1911, and it would be below that—

and perhaps as low as from 60 to 80 per cent.

Then, Mr. President, on page 691 of the document entitled "Wool and Manufactures of Wool," published in 1912, there is a table showing the comparative conversion cost from yarn to finished cloth of 53 samples of American cloth and similar English cloth. In the case of sample No. 1 the American cost is 8 cents and the English cost 4 cents; in the second the American cost is 8.3 cents and the English 4.1 cents; in the third the American cost is 8.9 cents and the English cost 4.8 cents, and in the other cases about the same difference is shown to exist.

If anyone understood me as intending to convey the idea that the difference in the cost of conversion, ranging all the way from 60 to 100 per cent, necessarily would require a duty of from 60 to 100 per cent on the value of the foreign product, he certainly misunderstood me or I did not accurately express myself.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If the Senator will pardon me, the Washington Post carries a story this morning evidently sent out by the Associated Press, and this is the headline:

McCUMBER defends rates. Lower than Tariff Commission had calculated as needed, he says.

That shows that even the press gallery construed the Senator's statement to mean that the committee had reported a rate lower than the Tariff Commission had recommended.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think if the Senator will ascertain to what that relates, he will find that it undoubtedly relates to the table that I put in the RECORD on yesterday following the table which was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts himself, a table made by the Actuary of the Treasury Department, in which he takes the average rate upon each paragraph of Schedule K in 1910, and then makes an estimate of what it would be under the pending bill for the year 1922, and shows a greatly decreased ad valorem rate of duty. That, of course, is absolutely true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. As I now understand the Senator from North Dakota, he did not intend to state, and does not intend that his remarks of yesterday shall be construed to indicate, that the Tariff Commission made any recommendation about the tariff duty which would be required; that what

ever duty was levied by the committee was levied after the committee had studied the question, with the aid of such tables and information as were available to them, and after the hearing of all the evidence?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly. The Tariff Commission is very careful always to make no recommendations in reference to any duty. It is so careful for fear it may be regarded as making a recommendation that, in many instances, it does not express itself as clearly as it might otherwise do.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That was the information that I had; and that is the reason I was surprised at the Senator's statement, and surprised at the construction put upon the statement, that in this case the committee had repudiated the recommendation of a higher rate claimed to have been made by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, Mr. President, I think the newspaper evidently must have gotten matters somewhat mixed. In the table which I introduced I simply sought to show that of the goods that would come in under the pending bill, when it passes, the ad valorem rate will be, I think, about 30 per cent less than the ad valorem rate upon similar goods which came in 1910 under the Payne-Aldrich law; and I think I am absolutely correct in that.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I am quite sure, in view of the Senator's statement, that he would desire the RECORD to show that he wishes to correct the statement which he made on yesterday, wherein he said:

And taking all of the importations at that time we arrived at the fact, and it was so reported by the Tariff Commission, that the differential which would require protection to put the two upon an equal footing was from 60 to 70 per cent, and we gave 50 per cent.

Mr. McCUMBER. Possibly I should have stated from all of the testimony that we concluded that it would require about 50 per cent. I did not intend to convey the idea that that was based entirely upon the Tariff Commission's report nor based entirely upon the difference in cost of conversion as shown in the tables.

Mr. LENROOT. Nor did he intend to say the Tariff Commission had reported that 60 to 70 per cent ad valorem protection would be required.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; the Tariff Commission did not so report, but the committee, if it had followed the recommendation of the Reynolds report and some of the other evidence and held to that alone, would have had to so conclude.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is a different story. The statement I wanted to challenge was that the Tariff Commission had recommended a higher rate. This all amounts, as I understand, to this, that the cost of converting the wool into cloth represents about 50 per cent; and the Tariff Commission reported the difference between the conversion in America and England was 60 to 80 per cent, which would make the conversion duty practically between 60 and 80 per cent of the 50 per cent cost of conversion, or between 30 and 40 per cent, which I stated yesterday.

Mr. McCUMBER. The difference in the cost of conversion might be even more than that, but, as I have stated before, that would not necessarily mean 40 or 50 or 60 per cent; it would depend, of course, upon the cost of the goods.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Massachusetts yields the floor?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has called my attention to the wording of the compensatory duty in this paragraph, and suggested that it ought to conform with the wording in other paragraphs, and I myself think it should. Therefore, I should like to modify the amendment of the committee, on line 13, after the word "made," by inserting the words "wholly or in chief value"; then, after the word "wool," in line 13, strike out "or of which wool is a component material, whether or not constituting chief value," so that the paragraph as modified would read:

PAR. 1111. Pile fabrics, cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the whole surface, made wholly or in chief value of wool, and manufactures, in any form, made or cut from such pile fabrics, 45 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as proposed to be modified by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have no objection to the modification suggested, but I shall want a record vote on the paragraph.



Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing that the yeas and nays should be called on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah, which is merely to correct the text, may be adopted first.

Mr. SMOOT. It may all be treated as one amendment, if that is desired, or the Senator can have a separate vote if he wishes.

Mr. LENROOT. I suggest that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah to the amendment may be adopted by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMOOT. We can adopt now the amendment which I have just suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified in behalf of the committee by the Senator from Utah.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to modify the committee amendment to paragraph 1111 so as to read:

PAR. 1111. Pile fabrics, cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the whole surface, made wholly or in chief value of wool, and manufactures, in any form, made or cut from such pile fabrics, 45 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification? The Chair hears none. The question now is on the amendment of the committee to paragraph 1111 as modified.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that I shall reserve for a separate vote in the Senate the committee amendment to paragraph 1109.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I omitted to state when I was on my feet that the duties in paragraph 1111, as originally reported by the committee, were even higher than those of the Payne-Aldrich law, and I think they are as high now, even as the amendment has been modified by the Senator from Utah. I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee as modified, on which the Senator from Massachusetts asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again state the paragraph as proposed to be amended.

The reading clerk again stated the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee as modified. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). Transferring my pair as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], I vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and therefore withhold my vote. If the Senator from California were present, he would vote "yea" on this question, and I would vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIS (when his name was called). I am paired for the day with my colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DIAL. I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HARRIS. Making the same announcement as before as to my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is absent from the Senate to-day. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 16, as follows:

#### YEAS—33.

Borah	Kellogg	Moses	Spencer
Brandagee	Kendrick	Nelson	Stanfield
Bronssard	Keyes	Newberry	Sterling
Burnam	Lenroot	Nicholson	Wadsworth
Capper	Lodge	Norbeck	Warren
Cummins	McCumber	Oddie	Willis
Curtis	McKinley	Phipps	
Gooding	McLean	Ransdell	
Jones, Wash.	McNary	Smoot	

#### NAYS—16.

Ashurst	Harris	Robinson	Swanson
Caraway	Heflin	Sheppard	Trammell
Culberson	Myers	Simmons	Underwood
Dial	Overman	Stanley	Walsh, Mass.

#### NOT VOTING—47.

Ball	France	La Follette	Reed
Calder	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Shields
Cameron	Gerry	McKellar	Shortridge
Coit	Glass	New	Smith
Crow	Hale	Norris	Sutherland
Dillingham	Harrell	Owen	Townsend
du Pont	Harrison	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Hitchcock	Pepper	Watson, Ga.
Elkins	Johnson	Pittman	Watson, Ind.
Ernst	Jones, N. Mex.	Poinexter	Weller
Fernald	King	Pomerene	Williams
Fletcher	Ladd	Rawson	

So the amendment of the committee as modified was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 147, after line 18, to strike out:

PAR. 1112. Blankets, wholly or in part of wool, not exceeding 3 yards in length, plain woven, with not more than one color in warp or filling, and not advanced beyond weaving by any process of finishing, valued at not more than 75 cents per pound, 20 cents per pound and, in addition thereto, 20 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 75 cents but not more than \$1.50 per pound, 25 cents per pound and, in addition thereto, 20 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$1.50 per pound, 30 cents per pound and, in addition thereto, 20 per cent ad valorem.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

PAR. 1112. Blankets and similar articles, including carriage and automobile robes and steamer rugs, made of blanketing, wholly or in chief value of wool, not exceeding 3 yards in length, valued at not more than 50 cents per pound, 20 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents but not more than \$1 per pound, 30 cents per pound and 32½ per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$1 but not more than \$1.50 per pound, 33 cents per pound and 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$1.50 per pound, 40 cents per pound and 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, in the case of blankets the protective rates are practically the same as those in the Payne-Aldrich law, but on account of the change in the raw-wool rate the compensatory rates are higher. This, of course, means that the total duty levied upon blankets is higher than ever before. It also means that the consumers will have to pay more for blankets than ever before.

As I said in the case of the last paragraph, I am not going to take the time of the Senate to discuss the principles that I attempted to outline yesterday in the debate on woolen manufactures. I simply want to call attention to the fact that in the case of blankets, unlike most of these woolen manufactures, we export more than we import. We have a fair export business in blankets and the imports are negligible. If the domestic industry was not troubled by competition from imports under total duties of 35 per cent, why is there need of these high duties of 40 cents per pound of wool plus 40 per cent ad valorem? I can only reiterate what I have said before, that I am unable to find any information which justifies the levying of these duties and the consequent result that will follow, that the price of blankets will be higher than ever before to the American consumer.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I simply want to say that the equivalent ad valorem in this bill is very much less than it was in the Payne-Aldrich law, but the Senator's statement as to the compensatory duty is about correct, although in the first bracket in this bill the rate is 20 cents and 30 per cent, and in the Payne-Aldrich law it was 22 and 30.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What does the Senator say the protective duty was in the Payne-Aldrich law?

Mr. SMOOT. The first bracket in the Payne-Aldrich Act was 22 cents a pound and 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is the same as it is here.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it is 20 cents a pound here.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And 30 per cent protective duty.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I said that the protective duty was the same and the compensatory duty was higher, by reason of the higher duty upon raw wool.

Mr. SMOOT. That is as I understood the Senator; but I call attention to the fact that even with higher wool in the present bill the compensatory duty on the first bracket of blankets is 20 cents, and in the Payne-Aldrich bill it was 22 cents; so it is lower there.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Slightly lower; very slightly.

Mr. SMOOT. The next bracket is 30 cents, and under the Payne-Aldrich law was 33 cents.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What was the protective duty in the second bracket of the Payne-Aldrich law?

Mr. SMOOT. Forty per cent.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In the second?

Mr. SMOOT. In the second bracket, and in this bracket it is 32½ per cent.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. My statement has been challenged, and I am going to state what I find it to be.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not do it in a spirit of criticism at all.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Oh, no; I understand; but the Senator says that the rates named here are less than those in the Payne-Aldrich law.

Mr. SMOOT. The equivalent ad valorem.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The highest bracket in the Payne-Aldrich law has a compensatory duty of 33 cents and a protective duty of 40 per cent. The highest bracket in this amendment has a compensatory duty of 40 cents, as against 33 cents in the Payne-Aldrich law, and a protective duty of 40 per cent, as against the 40 per cent in the Payne-Aldrich law. Of course, the highest bracket is the most important bracket, because it refers to the blankets that have the most wool in them.

Mr. SMOOT. I intended to go through each bracket and show just what the changes were. I began with the first two brackets, and, of course, they happen to be lower.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the Senator, in fairness, ought to state that the rates are very, very close to, if not identical with, the rates in the Payne-Aldrich law.

Mr. SMOOT. With the exception of the equivalent ad valorem of both of them, and in that case it is because of the lower price of blankets at the time they were made. I want to say to the Senator that I have not made any statement on the floor that I do not believe is fair. I do not try to dodge a question in any way, shape, or form. I admit that the compensatory duty in the last bracket is 35 cents instead of 33, but the Senator knows the reason for that, and he has stated frankly the reason why that was. We have not given the amount in the lower brackets because I know that at those prices it would be largely wool waste, and therefore I am only taking wool waste into consideration here in giving compensatory duties, and the Payne-Aldrich act does not take that into consideration as far as we did.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Of course, we are agreed that there was no compensatory duty under the Underwood law, and merely a protective duty of 25 per cent. It is now proposed that there should be a compensatory duty of 40 cents per pound and a protective duty of 40 per cent in the highest bracket, against the Underwood duty of only 25 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. But the Senator will remember that in the Payne-Aldrich law carriage and automobile robes carried a duty of 35 per cent, and we have put them all together here, and they are all carrying the same rate of duty, namely, 40 per cent. So, as far as the carriage and automobile robes are concerned, there is only 5 per cent difference between the existing law and this, and there is the other difference of 10 per cent more on the blankets—the protective rate on the blankets.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I think this is probably the only remaining paragraph I wish to comment upon, but I do want to say a word about this paragraph.

I would like to ask the Senator from Utah what reasons actuated the committee in increasing the present rate, so far as the protection is concerned. I say nothing about the compensatory rate.

Mr. SMOOT. We had the Tariff Commission make a thorough investigation in June of 1922, and they took samples at that time from the Sanford Mills, of Sanford, Me.; W. F. Libbey Co., of Lewiston, Me.; Stroock Plush Co., of Newburgh, N. Y.; Orr Felt & Blanket Co., of Piqua, Ohio. I do not want to identify the costs of each one of these, but I am giving the names of the mills, and I want the Senator to understand, if I give any comparison, that I am not going to say which mill the figures refer to, because that would be unfair to the mills. I am going to give the names of the mills to show simply how thorough this investigation was in June of this year.

There is also Shuler & Benninghofen, of Hamilton, Ohio; Beckman Co., of Cleveland, Ohio; Colonial Woolen Mills, Cleveland, Ohio; Portland Woolen Mills, Portland, Oreg.; Columbia Mills, Lewiston, Me. That is a fair selection of all of the blanket mills in the United States and in all sections of the country.

The articles which were taken were bed blankets, steamer rugs, and auto robes. In their report to the committee the commission gave a description of every one of these samples. For instance, we will take camel's-hair nolls. They gave the percentage of the nolls used in the blankets and the percentage of the wool, then the weight of the cotton warp, if it were a cotton warp, and if it were a wool warp they gave the amount of wool, and also the nolls used in that wool. Then they took three types of blankets, called the highest and the lowest, and what they termed the bulk sale of the blankets; that is, the lowest cost, the highest cost, and the cost of the bulk of the blankets which went into the trade. Then they gave the selling price per pound, and each one of these is then converted into the equivalent ad valorem which would be necessary in order to protect the blankets.

Mr. LENROOT. Did the Senator say they gave the cost?

Mr. SMOOT. They gave the percentage of conversion cost in each case.

Mr. LENROOT. What was that percentage?

Mr. SMOOT. In stating this I am not going to give the name of the mill.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not want the Senator to name the mills.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to read the percentages in the same way I read the names of the mills, but in this first one to which I shall refer on the bulk of the goods sold it was 39.8 per cent. That is the only one we had of that kind. Then I will take another one. It showed 49.4 per cent on the high and 35.4 per cent on the low.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator give me those figures again?

Mr. SMOOT. Forty-nine and four-tenths per cent on the high and 35.4 on the low, and on the bulk of the goods it was 42.8 per cent.

On the next one it was 71 per cent on the high, 62 per cent on the low, and 63½ on the bulk. Then I take another one. On the high it was 73 per cent, on the low 67 per cent, and they do not give the conversion cost on the bulk. Another one shows 82 per cent on the high, 60 per cent on the low, and 67 per cent on the bulk.

Mr. LENROOT. Where the conversion cost is 82 per cent, what kind of material was used?

Mr. SMOOT. That was an auto robe, and it would be a pretty good auto robe. I will say to the Senator that in that particular case the cost price was running about a dollar a pound.

Mr. LENROOT. Is that on the material or the finished product?

Mr. SMOOT. That is the finished product. I will run through this quickly. They run 72, 73, 63, 51, 64, 82, 80, 81, 44, 50, and 54. There is no need of giving any others, because that is a fair sample of what the report shows.

Mr. LENROOT. Take the case of the auto robe. Does the Senator mean to say that the material in that represented but 18 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. The conversion cost was 82 per cent and—

Mr. LENROOT. The material would represent only 13 per cent, then.

Mr. SMOOT. We know the conversion cost in the case of that particular article; we know that the cost of that was \$1 and the great bulk of it must have been cotton. They used a cotton warp and most cotton in the filling, or approximately that. That could not be done in the case of cloth, but in a blanket it could be. In fact, they made cotton blankets which were gigged so that a few feet off you could hardly tell them from wool.

Mr. LENROOT. Did the Tariff Commission give the exports of the mills or say what they did with the products?



Mr. SMOOT. They have not made that report.

Mr. LENROOT. Upon the matter of blankets the information which the Senator has given us would be valuable provided we had comparable conversion costs of foreign manufacturers, and provided we had the figures of imports which had a bearing upon the question. Very hastily figuring this, with an average of 42 per cent conversion cost, it seems to me these rates will cover, not the difference in conversion cost but will equal the entire American conversion cost in a great many cases. It is bound to be so, from the figures the Senator has given.

What are the facts with reference to what the Tariff Commission reports as to these blankets, as to imports, exports, and production? The imports are absolutely negligible. The imports of blankets in 1920 were valued at only \$40,000; in 1921, for nine months, they were valued at \$48,000. The exports of blankets in 1920 amounted to \$1,257,000, as against imports of \$40,000.

Mr. SMOOT. There is an explanation for that.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to have it.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to give it to the Senator and to the Senate. A considerable part of the blankets exported in 1920 went to Russia. Senators know that in that year everybody was fighting for goods. That was the year of peak prices. It was a question of securing goods, not what the price was. That is the reason that shows the exportations of that year so high.

Mr. LENROOT. The Tariff Commission states that in 1918 about 80 per cent of the exports went to Italy. I can well understand that. That was immediately following the war. In 1919 about one-half went to France and Austria. In 1920 about one-half went to Russia and Asia, a considerable part to Mexico, Turkey, and Poland.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not care to go into details of the Poland purchases of that year.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin state the date of the shipment to Poland?

Mr. LENROOT. The Tariff Commission does not report it, except as 1920.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the year they were looking for goods all over the world, and they could not get them in sufficient quantities anywhere.

Mr. LENROOT. But the important point after all, Mr. President, is not the amount of our exports, although that has a bearing. The important factor is, are we importing in great quantities under the present tariff rate of 25 per cent ad valorem? We are not. We have not been at any time. The Tariff Commission reports that despite a distinct lowering of duty in 1913 the imports immediately thereafter increased only slightly.

Now, Mr. President, I submit that there has not been any showing made for the increase that is proposed by the committee upon this article of universal use. The Senator from Utah has given the conversion cost of the American mill. That has no bearing on it unless we have other costs with which to make comparisons, and also unless we have imports coming in to bear out the difference in conversion cost, if there be such difference. The House rate, I am frank to say, I think is too low.

I am going to propose an amendment. I move to amend in line 8 by striking out the numeral "30" and inserting the numeral "25," in line 10 by striking out the numeral "32½" and inserting "30," and in line 13 by striking out the numeral "40" and inserting the numeral "35." I present it as one amendment, so that there may be one vote on all three.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 148, in line 8, strike out "30" and insert "25"; in line 10 strike out "32½" and insert "30"; and in line 13 strike out the numeral "40" where it occurs the second time and insert "35," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 1112. Blankets and similar articles, including carriage and automobile robes and steamer rugs, made of blanketing, wholly or in chief value of wool, not exceeding 3 yards in length, valued at not more than 50 cents per pound, 20 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 50 cents but not more than \$1 per pound, 30 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$1 but not more than \$1.50 per pound, 33 cents per pound and 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$1.50 per pound, 40 cents per pound and 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LENROOT. I ask for the yeas and nays on agreeing to my amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). Transferring my pair as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). On this vote I understand that my pair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], if present, would vote as I intend to vote. I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with my colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded.

Mr. DIAL. Making the same announcement as to my pair and transfer as on the previous ballot, I vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS. Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. NEW. Making the same announcement as on the previous vote with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

The roll call resulted—yeas 22, nays 23, as follows:

#### YEAS—22.

Ashurst	Heflin	Overman	Trammell
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard	Underwood
Caraway	Kellogg	Simmons	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lenroot	Stanley	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Myers	Sterling	
Harris	Norbeck	Swanson	

#### NAYS—23.

Brandeggee	Kendrick	McNary	Smoot
Broussard	Keyes	Moses	Spencer
Bursum	Lodge	New	Stanfield
Curtis	McCumber	Newberry	Warren
Ernst	McKinley	Oddie	Willis
Gooding	McLean	Philips	

#### NOT VOTING—51.

Ball	France	McCormick	Reed
Borah	Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Robinson
Calder	Gerry	Nelson	Shields
Cameron	Glass	Nicholson	Shortridge
Colt	Hale	Norris	Smith
Crow	Harrell	Owen	Sutherland
Culberson	Harrison	Page	Townsend
Dillingham	Hitchcock	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
du Pont	Johnson	Pittman	Watson, Ga.
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Poindexter	Watson, Ind.
Elkins	King	Pomerene	Weller
Fernald	Ladd	Ransdell	Williams
Fletcher	La Follette	Rawson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum of the Senate not having voted, the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know that is the usual program in such cases, but I think it would be almost useless to spend hours here in attempting to secure and to maintain a quorum this afternoon. That being the case, I move that the Senate now take a recess, the recess being in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into earlier to-day, until Monday next at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until Monday, July 31, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY  
NEW CASTLE, PA.